A FURTHER

INDICATION

OF THE

DISSENTERS

FROM THE

Rector of Bury's

UNJUST ACCUSATIONS,

WHEREIN

The Charge of their being *Corrupters* of the *WORD of GOD*, is *Demonstrated* to be False and Malicious.

The pretended *Justification* and *Confirmation* of it to be Groundless, Weak and Self-condemning.

The Titles of the *Psalms* to be Divinely Inspired.

The Purity of the *Hebrew Copies* is *Asserted*.

The *Scotch* Church and Bibles *Defended*.

The Rector *Convicted* of Corrupting the Word of God, by Adding to it, and Diminishing from it, in several *Instances*.

And his unworthy *Calumnies* of St. *Jerom* and other Good Men, *Detected* and *Confuted*.

By *James Owen*, Minister of the Gospel at *Oswestry*.

Psalm 120. 3. *What shall be done unto thee, thou false Tongue?* Prov. 12. 19. *The lips of Truth shall be Established for ever, but a lying Tongue is but for a moment.*

Κρείττον γὰρ μὴν μίσος ἢ συκοφαντία.
Metaphr. sub nom. Greg. Nazian. in *Eccl.* 7.

LONDON:

... Bridge, for *Tho. Parkhurst*, at the Bible and Three ... in *Cheapside* near *Mercers* Chapel, ...

ERRATA.

Page 1. Line 1. for *had* r. *hath*, P. 7. l. 9. for *the* r. *this Rule*, P. 10. l. 22. for *he* r. *we*, P. 16. l. 3. for 1638 r. 1658, P. 22. l. 3. a fin. r. *takes*, P. 28. l. 2. r. *Article*, P. 31. l. 2. for *book* r. *look*, P. 33. l. 7. dele *the* before *Jeruſalem*, ibid. l. 19. r. *Magdeburg*. P. 36. l. 8, and 12. for *reaping* r. *ripping*, Cut off Fol. 39, and 40. being the Title Page before the Poſtſcript, P. 42. l. 25. for *cover'd* r. *Coeval*, P. 46. l. 2. a fin. r. *Full*. P. 48. l. 10. for *i. e. two* r. *1ſt*, and *2d*, ibid l. 32. r. *obſerve*, P. 49. l. 2. r. 90, P. 50. l. 3. a fin. r. *Pol.* ibid l. 7. a fin. r. *ſerves*, P. 51. l. 3. r. *anſwer*, ibid l. 3. a fin. r. ϕλοκῆς, ibid l. 21. a fin. r. *Num:* 23. 9. P. 52. l. 19. r. ἐγκαινισμὸν, P. 53. l. 1. for *mind* r. *mine*, P. 54. l. 3. a fin. r. *miſrepreſents him*, P. 55: l. 27. r. *Vilis*, l. 9. a fin. r. *utique* and for *ille* r. *illo*, l. 8. a fin. r. *ignotus*, P. 56. l. 3. a fin. r. *Fretell*. P. 57. l. 17. r. *Pſalms about*, P. 58. l. 26. for *impious* r. *impure*, P. 60. l. 5. a fin. r. κηῆσαι, P. 61. l. 3. a fin. after *not* add *only*, P. 62. l. 19. for *ſer* r. *ſeu*, ibid l. 9. a fin. for *fourth* r. *fifth*, P. 63. l. 25. for *Coequal* r. *Coeval*, P. 64. l. 3. a fin. r. *Judæos*, P. 65. l. 7. dele *uſed*, P. 66. l. 12. after Lxx add *or*, ibid l. 16. r. *Originals*, ibid l. 30. r. *inſerted*, ibid l. 13. a fin. for *of* r. *by*, ibid l. 9. a fin. r. *Argument*, ibid l. 3. a fin. for *and* r. &, ibid l. 2. a fin. r. *ſcripturam*, P. 67. l. laſt r. *Conſtabit*, P. 68. l. 28. r. *pereant*, ibid l. 31. for 2000 r. 6000, ibid l. 34. r. *that of the Hebrew*, ibid l. 17. r. *Autolyc*, P. 69 l. 10. r. *uſque* and *proæm*, ibid l. 16. for *theſe* r. *this*, P. 70. l. 12. a fin. for *above* r. *about* ibid l. 23. r. *Cod. regys.*

There are other Faults of the Preſs, occaſion'd by the Authors diſtance from it, which the Candid Reader is deſired to overlook.

A FURTHER VINDICATION OF THE DISSENTERS FROM Mr. *GIPP*'s Unjuſt Accuſations.

CHAP. I.

Containing ſome Animadverſions on his Firſt Chapter.

IT had been obſerved of the Authors of the moſt inconſiſtent Un-truths, that by often reporting them, they come at laſt to believe 'em themſelves, and with a recollected Effrontery to recommend 'em to the eaſie World as undoubted and unconteſtable Verities.

The Reverend *Rector* of *Bury* in *Lancaſhire*, has given ſuch a diſcovery of this Spirit as will hardly admit of a Parallel. In a Sermon of his he advanced a vile Charge againſt the *Presbyterians* of *Corrupting the Word of God* by Miſ-printing *ye* for *we* in Acts 6. 3. A Charge ſo black, ſo ſenſeleſs, ſo inconſiſtent with their known Principles, ſo weakly grounded, that none but ſuch as have abandon'd the *Charity*, which is Eſſential to a *Chriſtian*, and ſacrificed the *Reaſon* which conſtitutes a *Man*, to the abſurdeſt Prejudices, can entertain it under any other Character, than that of a malitious and ſilly Calumny. I have fully proved it to be ſuch in my *Remarks* on his Sermon, and have charitably call'd upon him to give Glory to God, and conſult his own Peace in a dying Hour, by acknowledging his Offence againſt God, in whoſe Name he hath publiſhed the Vileſt of Falſhoods.

It would have contributed more to his preſent Reputation and future Comfort, ingenuouſly to have retracted an *uncharitable Preſumption*, than to have attempted to *confirm* his Charge, as he calls it, by a *Defence* of his Firſt Arguments which is ſo very weak, that it not only convincingly *Juſtifies* the *Diſſenters* againſt his Accuſations, but *condemns* himſelf to be a Man that can aſſume the Liberty to affirm any thing, be it never ſo falſe and abſurd, when it ſerves to expoſe an adverſe Party. This will evidently appear when I have conſidered his *Defence*, and the *additional Proofs*.

I deſire the Reader to take Notice that it is *Matter of Fact*, and not any point of Controverſy we are now upon, namely, *whether the Presbyterians be Guilty of Corrupting the Word of God?* The Rector *affirms* it in his Sermon, and pretends to *confirm* it, in his Defence of it. I doubt not but all Men, who have any regard to Truth or commom Honeſty, will expect a very clear, direct proof of ſo High a Charge, againſt a great Body of ſober People, and will not eaſily take uncharitable Suſpicions for evident Proofs.

Inſtead of a *direct Proof*, his Sermon produceth only a *circumſtantial one*. But in his *Remarks* upon *Remarks* (as he ſtiles the defence of his Sermon) he pretends to *confirm his Charge*, for thus his Title-Page runs, "The *Rector* of *Bury's* Charge "exhibited againſt the *Diſſenters* for endeavouring to Corrupt the *Word* of *God*, "Juſtified and further Confirmed.

When a Charge is *Juſtified* and *Confirmed*, the Proofs are ſuppoſed to be Clear and Convincing; but you'l ſoon find your ſelves miſtaken if you expect any ſuch thing in the Rectors *Remarks*. He *affirms*, with a brazen Confidence, and *confirms* with Leaden Arguments, whoſe main Edge conſiſts in the baſeſt Sort of Railing and Calumny, againſt the living and the dead, and he gives it the *Keenneſs* that ſuch *Mettal* is capable of by the vigorous Application of that *Wheatſtone* which he deſerves.

But let's hear how he confirms his Charge.

1. Above thirty Pages of the ſixty four in his Book are on things Forreign to that Charge, which is the main Thing he was to confirm, and a great Part of the reſt of his Book is taken up in perſonal Reflections, which is a clear Evidence he wanted Materials for his *chief Point*.

2. He beſtows the three firſt Pages in reflecting on the Ingenious Author, of *the Notes upon the Lord Biſhop of* Saliſbury's *four laſt Diſcourſes*.

I never cou'd certainly tell who was the *Author* of thoſe Notes which I have not by me, and therefore can ſay nothing of 'em. If he retorts the Schiſm upon the impoſers of unſcriptual Terms of Communion, as the Rector ſeems to hint, he wou'd do well to anſwer his Arguments inſtead of branding him cauſeleſly, and in the rudeſt Manner with *ill Nature*, want of *good Breeding*, &c.

And now his Hand is in, the *Biſhop* himſelf can't eſcape his Cenſure, whom he takes upon him to *correct* for his too---- gentle Expreſſions of the Diſſenters, and wou'd have had him ſtyled them *the Foxes and Firebrands of this Church and Nation*, that is he would teach the *Judicious* and *Moderate* Prelate to ſpeak the Language of the *confident and fiery* Author of the Sermons of *Allegiance*. Here the Rector gives the Diſſenters an Inſtance of his *good Nature*, and the Biſhop of his *good Breeding*. *p.* 3.

3. Rather than want Objects of his Anger, he'l dig into the Graves of the Dead. If he has not the courage to meet their Ghoſts (which *he is not ſure of* p. 17.) he dares trample upon their Memories: He gives a Proof of this in the Aſperſions he caſts on the Reverend Mr. *Baldwin*, who is now with the Lord. *p.* 4.

He

He has pick'd up ſome imperfect Notes of an old Sermon of his, which has ſo filled his Head, that his Reflections upon it is become the *ſtanding Preface* to all his late Works. He mentions it in his *Tentamen Novum*, here you find it again, and becauſe you can't have too much of a good Thing, he promiſes you ſhall hear more of it another time.

4. At length, ſenſible of his *Impertinency*, he aſks, *What's this to the Miniſter at* Oſweſtry? Indeed nothing at all, however it helps to fill up Paper for want of better Matter.

But doth he in Earneſt think to reſolve his Queſtion by this following one, "And I alſo aſk, What was it to the Miniſter at *Oſweſtry*, If the Rector of *Bury* "preached a Sermon in Vindication of the Church of *England*, againſt the *Lan-* "*caſhire* Diſſenters? The Sermon he preached and which I anſwered, Charges the Diſſenters in General with Corrupting the Word of God, eſpecially thoſe in *Cambridge* in the year 1638. And affirms that the Corruption has been *ſecretly promoted* by that Party ever ſince; that it has been publickly own'd by a *Scotch Chameronian*: And was all this Charge againſt the *Lancaſhire Diſſenters*, who are not ſo much as mention'd in the whole Sermon? A Man that dare thus boldly Charge the Body of *Engliſh* and *Scotch Presbyterians*, and then think to come off by ſaying, his Sermon was againſt *the Lancaſhire Diſſenters*, may affirm or deny any thing at his Pleaſure. It it a bad Omen to ſtumble thus at the Threſhold. Had the Rector preach'd a Sermon only againſt the *Lancaſhire Diſſenters* (as I hear he has done many) he ſhould never have heard from the Miniſter at *Oſweſtry*. But when he not only Preaches, but publiſhes an Invective againſt the whole Body, I judged my ſelf concern'd to vindicate Truth and Innocency. Since he is upon aſking Queſtions, I will take the freedoom to aſk him one, *What is it to the Rector of* Bury, *if I thought fit to Vindicate my Ordination by Presbyters, whileſt I allow'd the Validity of Epiſcopal Ordination?* I only juſtified Ordination by Preſbytery, but did not condemn that by Biſhops. This is the deſign of my Plea for Scripture Ordination, which one wou'd have thought inoffenſive. But the Rector, like the old *Donatiſts*, confining the Miniſtry, Sacraments and Salvation, to thoſe of his own Communion, would needs take upon him to anſwer my Book. This occaſion'd my *Tutamen Evangelicum*; which I had no ſooner ſent into the Preſs, but his Sermon came to my Hands: When I had read it over, I was eaſily perſuaded to draw up a few Remarks upon it.

But the Rector, who is the unhappieſt Man in the World at Conjectures, and perhaps one of the boldeſt in affirming 'em for Truths, wou'd prove from *the different Air in the Remarks from Mr.* Owen's *other Writings that he is but the reputed Father of this ſpurious Off-ſpring*: Who then is the true Father? Why, he believes the *Note-Maker was principal in the Remarks, and that they are the Work of a Club of Miniſters, and that the Remarkers true Name is* Legion, *for they are* many. *p.* 5.

If the poor Rector had not been *grievouſly tormented* by the *Remarks*, he had ſcarce thought of this *frightful Name*. He finds himſelf driven to a *Precipice* with the *briſtled Herd* in the Goſpel, and wou'd fain keep *above water*, but who can relieve the *Animal*, whom a *Legion* purſues?

To be Serious, I thought he had more Senſe than to deny the *Remarks* to be mine, becauſe they are written in a Stile different from my Writings upon other Subjects. Any Author that underſtands the Laws of Writing, will adapt his Style to the Subject he is upon. If my lines are ſomething pointed, the Rector's *infamous detraction*, by which he had expoſed a vaſt Body of *Proteſtants* to an unjuſt and publick reproach, muſt be my Apology. I perceive he is a great Stranger to the *Diſſenters*, when he affirms my *Remarks* to be *dreſt up with all the gaudy Feathers and Embelliſhments, which the Wit of the Party cou'd furniſh them with*. They were wholly dreſt up, ſuch as they are, by my ſelf, and the habit they appear in is neither *Sordid* nor

Gay;

Gay; the *Truth* and *Innocency*, they aſſert, deſires not the former, nor needs the latter. A very ſmall degree of Wit will enable a Man to expoſe the Rector's *Defamatory Libel*, which has as little of *Wit* as it has of *Honeſty*. I will not be ſo Injurious to the Reputation of *his Party* as to ſuſpect any Man of *Wit* and *Candor* among 'em, to have contributed ſo much as a ſingle Stroke to the Criminatory part of his *Sermon*, which ſo reſembles the true Father, that not only his Figure, but his very Soul and Spirit are ſquez'd into it. *p.* 5.

" But the *Remarks*, in their way to *London*, took a tour to *Mancheſter*. *p.* 5.

They did ſo, for *Zachary Whitworth* of *Mancheſter* undertook the Printing of 'em. I preſume the Miniſters might read 'em, but I dare affirm, and ſo will they, that they neither alter'd them, in whole, or in part, nor added to 'em, except *two lines* in *p.* 11. and the ſhort *Adverſiſment* after the end of my Book. And now for his Satisfaction I have made him my Confeſſor for this once, if it may be any relief to him to know by whom he *ſuffers*, for he ſeems like a Man deſperately wounded, who turns himſelf every way to behold the Hand that directed the fatal Arrow to his ſmarting Side.

Had the *Mancheſter Miniſters* put themſelves to the trouble of anſwering his Sermon, he would have felt more penetrating Strokes; nor is he ſo *formidable* that they need be afraid; or they ſo *deſpicable*, as to be aſham'd to own their *genuine Productions*.

5. He ſtuffs *p.* 6. and 7. with more Invectives againſt the Diſſenters, and indeed he never ſeems to be ſo much in his Element as when he is upon that Subject. But at laſt he comes to the *Remarks*, *p.* 8. and begins with the Preface.

In my Preface, which conſiſted of four Pages only, I gave a ſhort Account of the Heads of his Sermon, with brief Remarks upon ſome paſſages in it, which I judg'd Exceptionable. He has a long Chapter (*Chap.* 2.) which takes up near half his Book (from *p.* 8. to *p.* 32.) in anſwer to my ſhort Preface. I told him I would not intermeddle in the Controverſy between him and Mr. *De Laun*, nor will I now: I only touch'd upon a few things, concerning which I ſee no Cauſe to alter my Sentiments, by what he has offer'd, to the Contrary. But I will not detain the Reader from the main Poin, by attending his tedious digreſſion about the *Titles* of the *Pſalms*, and the *Corruptions* of the *Hebrew Text*, which I ſhall conſider in a Poſtſcript by it ſelf.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Being an Answer to the latter Part of his Second Chapter.

I Call'd the Rector's affirming the *Sadducees* to have rejected all but the Five Book of *Moses*, a *vulgar Error*, and gave my Reasons for it out of *Josephus* and *Lightfoot*, to whom I refer the Reader, whom I will not detain on this trifling Subject, on which the *Rector* bestows the best Part of two Pages. He says the Fathers were of another Opinion, and he hopes I will not thrust them into the *vulgar Form*. *p.* 27, 28.

It's certain the *Fathers* are not free from all the *vulgar Errors* of the Ages in which they lived; the Story of the *Phœnix*, springing out of the Ashes of the old One, is mentioned by several Fathers. *Clemens Romanus* has it, and would prove the *Resurrection* from it.

The ingenuous Rector here " desires his Reader to mark, how we are advocating " for the *Samaritans* and *Sadducees*, which in good Time the Dissenters will compre- " hend also. Some of the *Quakers* and *Anabaptists*, the modern *Sadducees* and *Mahometans* (I mean the *Socinians*), and almost all the Nation of *Schismaticks* and " *Hereticks* are in their interests already: The *Samaritans* and *Jews* are happily com- " ing into the confederacy. *p.* 27.

I advocate no further for them than Dr. *Lightfoot*, to whose *Judgment* the *Rector promises to stand*; thus he speaks, " * It's the received Opinion amongst the Learn'd, " that the *Sadducees* refused all the old Testament but only the *Five Books of Moses*: " If they mean it absolutely, I must confess my small reading hath not taught so " far as to be satisfied in that: But if they mean it with some Qualification, it's " very True. In such a qualified Sense, as to say the rest of the *Jews* refused the " third Part of the Bible, *i. e.* the *Hagiographa*, viz. *Job*, *Psalms*, *Solomon*'s Writ- " tings, *Daniel*, &c. They admitted not the reading of these in the *Synagog*, not " because they undervalued them, but because they counted the rest Sufficient, *i. e.* " *the Law and Prophets*, which were read every Sabbath. *p.* 27.

The *Church* of *England* admits not the reading of some Parts of the Bible in the publick Congregation, will you therefore *say she rejects them?*

2. But be this Matter as it will, the Rector's inference has as little *Sense* in it, as it has *Truth* and *Charity*. If he means, that the *Quakers*, *Anabaptists* and *Socinians*, are in the Interests of the *Presbyterians*, it is a vile Calumny. If he means that they are Dissenters from the *Episcopal Churches*, so they are from the *Presbyterian* also. Though I must tell him, that the *Socinians* in some of their printed Pamphlets, declare themselves of the *Church* of *England*, nor do I hear that they are expell'd their Communion, when any of them are disposed to joyn with her. Nay it's well known that Mr. *S. N.* a *beneficed Parson* of the Church of *E.* is the Author of several of the late *Socinian Pamphlets*. I mention not this to reflect on the Church of *England* who disowns this Heresy, and ought not to be charged with the Errors of particular Persons, but as a necessary Vindication of our selves. I do not know any one Congregation of Dissenters that wou'd tolerate a *Socinian* in their Communion.

---

* Li. Vol. II. *P.* 1101, 1102.

As to the *Samaritans* and *Jews* I know none fitter for their Confederacy than the Rector of *Bury*, who helps them to a *Chronological Argument* out of our *Engliſh* Bibles to diſprove the coming of Chriſt in the Fleſh: For according to our *Voſſian Rabbi*, Chriſt was not to come untill the 6000th Year of the World, and according to our Bibles the World is not yet 6000 years Old.

Mr. *G.* in his Sermon call'd the Scripture, the *ſupreme Rule of Faith*, to which I made this Anſwer, *We know no other Rule of divine Faith, but the holy Scripture.*

" The Rector undertakes to teach us ſeveral *Subordinate Rules of Faith*, ſuch as " *Creeds, Catechiſms*, Decrees of *Councils*, Teſtimony of *Fathers*, Dictates of wiſe " and good Men, the Inſtruſtions of Parents, Conſent of Adverſaries, the Voice " of Conſcience, Reaſon, Preaching, Providence, and laſtly univerſal Tradi- " tion. *p.* 29.

The Induſtrious Rector has found out no leſs than Twelve new *Rules* of *Faith*, and theſe may be multiplied into 12000, for every *Article* of a *Creed*, every *Canon* of a *Council*, every *Dictate* of a *wiſe* and *good Man*, every *Saying* of a *Father*, every *Paſſage in a Sermon*, is a *Rule of Faith with the Rector*. For Inſtance, we will ſuppoſe the Rector a *wiſe* and *good* Man, I hope then you'l receive all his Dictates for ſo many *Rules* of *Faith*, of which you have abundance in his *Remarks* upon *Remarks*, and among others, that all our *Bibles are Corrupted in very material Things.*

This look's a little Comical, the *ſupreme Rule of Faith is Corrupted*, and you muſt believe it, becauſe the *ſubordinate Rule*, the *wiſe* and *good* Rector's *Dictates* aſſures us of it, however it is not Impoſſible but the *ſupreme Rule* may be Right and Pure, and the *ſubordinate Rule Croked* and *Corrupt*. And the Rector will be ſo *Good* as to Pardon us, or ſo *Wiſe* as to Inſtruct us better, if we think ſo. I now begin to underſtand the Reaſon why he is ſo very Impatient of Oppoſition; why, all his *Dictates are Rules of Faith*, and ought to be received for Oracles: But the beſt on't is, he allows us the Benefit of another Rule of Faith, that is the *Light of Reaſon*; what if theſe two Rules happen to claſh? We have known *Creeds*, *Councils*, *Sermons*, &c. to do ſo; as contrary as they are, they are ſtill Rules of Faith with the Rector.

Yea the ſayings of the *Pagan wiſe Men* of *Greece*, are *Rules of Divine Faith* to him. and but for *Univerſal Tradition* he wou'd know no difference between *Plato*, *Seneca*, the *wiſe Men* of *Greece* (you may if you pleaſe put a wiſe Man of *Gotham* among them) and the holy Scripture, for ſaith he, " the excellency of it's " moral Precepts, the high Strains and noble Flights of Piety, prove not that it " was written by inſpiration, for then *Plato*, *Seneca*, *Ignatius*, *Clement. Romanus*, " the VII. *wiſe Men of Greece*, &c. might lay claim to inſpiration.

Would you think it, that a Proteſtant Divine, ſhould talk thus ignorantly of the bleſſed Scriptures? Are the Precepts in *Plato* and *Seneca*, as Excellent as thoſe of the Holy Bible? Can he find ſuch *high Strains* and *noble Flights of Piety* in *Pagan Authors*, as in the inſpired Writings? A Man that has felt the Power of God's Word renewing, quickning, comforting and ſtrengthening his Heart, will acknowledge the vaſt Difference between inſpired and humane Writings, and reſolve his Faith into the Authority of God, who ſpeaks powerfully and feelingly unto our Conſciences by his Spirit in the Scriptures, which have Signatures of their Divine Original upon them, that no Book beſides can lay claim to.

Tradition is of Uſe to beget in us a good Opinion of the Scripture, but he that makes it a *Rule of Faith*, eſpecially the *firſt* and *leading Rule* (as the Rector ſeems to do) reſolves his Faith into a humane Authority, which can beget but a *Humane Faith*. Divine Faith is founded upon a Divine Teſtimony, and a Humane Teſtimony can produce but a Humane Faith.

* *Lerinenſis* his Rule about Tradition is, *quod omnes ubiq; & ſemper.* All the Faithful have not at all times and in every Place, tranſmitted every Book of Scripture as of Divine Authority. The *Popiſh Church* pretend Tradition for the *Apocrypha*, which they receive as *Canonical*. Few of the People are able to judge of the Rule whether it be True, or Falſe; Miniſters may tell 'em of it, ſuppoſe they receive their *Dictates*, which few are able to Examin, they believe with an *Implicite Faith*, becauſe their Miniſters ſay ſo; and thus the *Subordinate Rule* becomes the *firſt and leading Rule.*

Creeds, Canons, Dictates of wiſe and good Men, and the like, are either agreeable to the Scripture, or they are not. If they be not, they are far from being Rules of Divine Faith, for they are Rules of Error and Falſhood: If they are agreeable to the Scripture, we believe and receive them, becauſe they are Conſonant to the Word of God, the only Rule of ſaving Divine Faith. We will allow 'em to be helps unto our Faith, but judge it very improper to call 'em Rules of Faith.

I told the Rector, That the laying aſide the Un-ſcriptural *Terms of Communion, which have been the fatal Engines of Diſunion and Schiſm, wou'd ſoon heal us.*

To this he Anſwers 1, " The Experiment has been once made, in the late " Times, but without Succeſs, Diviſions were increaſed, *&c.*

Things were in a fair way of healing, when the Conceſſions of King *Charles* I. were voted ſatisfactory by the Parliament, had not a Faction in the Army put all out of Courſe, and governed the Nation, by a very Arbitrary Power, and yet there were very hopeful beginnings of a Coalition------- between the moderate *Epiſcopal, Presbyterian* and *Congregational Brethren*, upon the Principle I mention, between the years 1652 and 1659, as appears by the *Worceſter-ſhire* Aſſociation, as alſo by thoſe of *Cumberland, Weſtmorland, Eſſex*, &c. which are to be ſeen in Print.

If this Principle did not heal us in thoſe diſtracting and unſettled Times, it does not follow that it would not do it now in a State of Settlement, and ſuch a Settlement, wherein the Biſhops are in Power, under whom the moderate Diſſenters wou'd not ſcruple to Exerciſe their Miniſtry, if the offenſive Terms were removed out of the way.

And if ever our unhappy Breaches be healed, it muſt be upon this Principle, which has been aſſerted by the Great Men of the *Epiſcopal* Communion.

† Dr. *Stillingfleet*, the preſent Biſhip of *Worceſter*, declares againſt *Un-ſcriptural Impoſitions.* " He that came to take away the Un-ſcriptural Yoke of *Jewiſh Ceremo-* " *nies*, certainly did never intend to Gall the Back of his Diſciples, with another " inſtead of it: And it would be ſtrange, the Church ſhould require more than " Chriſt himſelf did. What poſſible Reaſon can be aſſign'd, why ſuch Things " ſhou'd not be ſufficient for Communion with a Church, which are ſufficient for " Eternal Salvation? Without all Controverſy the main In-let of all the Diſtracti- " ons, Confuſions and Diviſions in the Chriſtian World, hath been by adding of " other Conditions of Church Communion, than Chriſt hath made.

---

* Vinc. Lerin. *adv. hæreſ.* † Iren. Pref.

My Lord *Bacon* ſaith, that the ancient and true Bounds of Unity, are one Faith, one Baptiſm, and not *one Ceremony, one Policy.* * The ſame was the Judgment of King *James* the I. *In non neceſſariis libertati Chriſtianæ locus detur.* † See Mr. *Tallents*'s healing Book of *large Foundations*, wherein you may find more Teſtimonies to this purpoſe.

2. The Rector preſcribes the method of healing us, and that is, " to obey them " that have the Rule over us in all lawful things, *i. e.* which are not forbidden by " God.

The meaning is, if I underſtand him, that Church Rulers have Power to impoſe Things lawful, *i. e.* not forbidden, as Terms of Communion, and that it is our Duty to obey ſuch impoſitions. This Explication premiſed, I anſwer,

1. He ought to prove, that Chriſt hath Commiſſion'd our Church Rulers to fix un-ſcriptural Terms of Chriſtian Communion, before he prove it our Duty to obey 'em. Where they have no power to command, I ſee not our obligation to obey. " The grand Commiſſion, ſaith Dr. *Stillingfleet*, the Apoſtles were ſent out with, " was only *to teach what Chriſt had Commanded them.* Not the leaſt intimation of any " Power given to impoſe or require any thing beyond what himſelf had ſpoken to " them, or they were directed to by the immediate Guidance of the Spirit of God. " * It is not whether the things required, be *lawful* or not,—— but whether they do " conſult for the Churches Peace and Unity, who ſuſpend it upon ſuch Things? " How far the Example of our Saviour, or his Apoſtles doth warrant ſuch *rigorous* " *Impoſitions*? We never read the Apoſtles making Laws, but of Things ſuppoſed " neceſſary.

2. He ought to ſhew, that all Things not forbidden may lawfully be impoſed as Terms of Communion. The uſe of *Oyl, Spittle, Salt, Cream*, &c. are not forbidden in Baptiſm, therefore the Rector wou'd ſubmit to the Uſe of them, if his Rulers think fit to enjoyn them, as is done in Popery. Holy Water is not *forbidden*, nor are any of the Ceremonies uſed in Popery expreſly *Prohibited* in Scripture, therefore they are lawful to the Rector. You ſee whither this Hypotheſis tends: *Sitting* at the Lords Supper is not forbidden, no more is *Proſtration*, the humbleſt Geſture of Adoration; the Rector would ſcarce like it, if either of theſe were rigidly *impoſed*.

3. Who muſt judge what is *Lawful*, what not? If thoſe that obey, we are but where we were; that which appears Lawful to the impoſer, may be judged otherwiſe by conſcientious Diſſenters, which is our Caſe: If the impoſers only muſt judge, Popiſh Rulers will ſay, it's Lawful to bow to a *Crucifix*, to a *Graven-Image*, to adore the *Bread* in the Euchariſt, &c. Let the Rector take which ſide of the Queſtion he pleaſe, he muſt either acquit the *Diſſenters* or juſtify the *Papiſts*.

He concludes his Second Chapter, with a Vindication of their reading *Apocrypha* in the Churches, to the Excluſion of ſeveral Parts of Scripture.

" Why do the Diſſenters neglect the reading of the Word of God to make way " for their Sermons and Expoſitions? *p.* 31.

If any do neglect reading the Scriptures, let 'em bear the blame of it, I know none ſuch. I hope he wou'd not have us lay aſide *Sermons* and *Expoſitions*, to fill up the whole time with reading the holy Scripture. They that *Expound* do alſo *Read*,

---

* *Refuſe. par.* 1. p. 129. † *Iſ. Caſaub. ep. ad Card Peron.* * *Iren. ubi ſupra.*

tho'

tho' not ſo much, yet perhaps to more Advantage, by helping the People to underſtand what they read. And if preaching (which alſo Explains the holy Scripture) take up moſt of the time in ſome Congregations, where leſs Scripture is read, it cannot be denied but preaching is an Ordinance of God, but ſo is not the reading of *Apocrypha*, and therefore this recrimination is impertinent. But ſaith the Rector, *to read the* Apocrypha *is not to Canonize it.*

I do not ſay it is; but to comprehend it under the Name of the *Holy Scripture*, as is done in the *Rubrick* before the *Table* of *Leſſons* in the *Liturgy*, and to read it to the total Excluſion of ſome Parts of Scripture, may tempt ignorant People to think it *Canonical.*

Many wiſe Men, adds he, think the Story of Bell *and* Dragon *to be true.* p. 31.

So the *Papiſts* do, and they think it *Canonical* too. They are Men *Wiſe* in their *Generation*, and the Dictates of Wiſe Men are a Rule of Faith to the Rector.

" But he is not ſure, but it may be a *Fiction*, or *Fable*, or in more civil Terms a " *Parable*, and many think ſaith he, the Book of *Job*, of this kind, a *Parable.* p. 31.

Names of Perſons, Countries and Places, don't uſe to be inſerted into Parables, as is done in the Story of *Bell* and *Dragon*, as alſo in the Book of *Job*, which he invidiouſly compares to this *fabulous Story.* The Book of *Job* is allow'd to be *Canonical* by all Chriſtians, and has all the Characters of a real Hiſtory, the Names of *Places*, *Perſons*, &c. his Children, Eſtate, Loſſes, Friends, Enemies and his Reſtoration are particularly deſcribed, and he is expreſly mention'd by the *Holy Ghoſt* in other Places, *Ez.* 14. 14. *James* 5. 11. and cited in 1 *Cor.* 3. 19. I find in *Pools Synopſis* but two Sorts of People that make the Hiſtory of *Job* a *Parable*, ſome Antient *Jews* and ſome Modern *Anabaptiſts*, but neither one nor 'tother at preſent ſeem to own that Opinion.

The Rector is a rare Man, he can convert an *Apocryphal* Fable into a *Divine Hiſtory*, and a *Divine Hiſtory* into a *Parabolical Fable.* And that you may not think him ſingular in this Faculty, he has *Papiſts*, *Jews* and *Anabaptiſts* in his Intereſts.

He that denies the Book of *Job* to be a Hiſtory, may in good Time, turn all Scripture Hiſtory into a Parable, or a *cunninly deviſed Fable*, and when he has ſerv'd a temporal Intereſt by it, may brag with the *Roman Pontiff*, whoſe Dictates the Rector muſt own for a Rule of Faith, *quantum nobis profuit hæc Fabula de Chriſto.*

CHAP. III.

Being an Anſwer to his Third Chapter.

IN his Third Chapter, he pretends to Anſwer my firſt, in which I obſerved (*p.* 1.) *That in a Sermon to the Clergy, a Teſtimony againſt the ſhameful Scandals of ſome of them, wou'd have became a faithful Miniſter.* but that he had other work to do, his Buſineſs being to *accuſe* of ſecret Crimes, and not to reprove for *open* Miſcarriages.

All the Rector can ſay for this *inexcuſable Omiſſion* and Partiality is, *That he dare* undertake *to point out as many Scandalous Diſſenting Miniſters in* Lancaſhire, *as we can Clergy Men.* p. 35.

He is a Man of *bold Undertaking*, but the one and the other are pretty well known in that Country and other Parts of the Nation, which will ſcarce receive the Dictates of this *daring Undertaker* againſt the Evidence of Senſe and common Obſervation. If he knows any *Scandalous Diſſenting Miniſters*, let him name the Men, and ſpare not.

I added *p.* 2, 3, 4. that the Corruption in *Acts* 6. 3. is inconſiſtent with the Principles of the Preſbyterians; that I never knew any that approv'd of that Corruption; that his Charge amounts to no more than a bare Suſpition that the Diſſenters have ſecretly contributed to the Corruption of this Place; that had not he Examin'd the Errata of the Preſs more out of ill Will to the Diſſenters, than good Will to the Publick, he might have found ſeveral other Errors of the Preſs as conſiderable as *ye* for *we*; as *ſhe* for *he*, in *Eph.* 1. 4. in a Twelves Bible, *London* 1691. *we* for *ye* in *Job* 6. 21. in a Quarto Edition of the Bible at *Cambridg*, 1675. and ſeveral more I mention there.

Among all theſe Particulars, he takes notice only of the laſt, and to excuſe himſelf, moſt falſly Affirms, *That all I offer in this Chapter, in Vindication of the Diſſenters, is, that ſeveral Editions of the Bible abound with ſuch Errors as are deſtructive of the Senſe.* Judge by this what Credit is to be given to the Rectors Affirmations, But let's hear what he can ſay to the Errors of the Preſs, of which I give a Catalogue. He has four Things to offer, *p.* 32, 33.

I. He quarrels with an Uncorrected Error of the Preſs (in ἁγίυς for ἁγίυς). And diſingenouſly inſinuates as if I were defective in the *Greek* Tongue. The Rector is grievouſly at a loſs how to make good his Charge, ſince he fills Paper with ſuch ſtuff as this.

II. Tho' he might be juſtly ſuſpected (ſaith the Rector), in the Account given of theſe *Errata*'s, yet I will admit it to be True. A mighty Favour indeed! To admit that for True which he cannot diſprove; but his moſt generous Conceſſions have a Tincture of his ill Nature, which is as *Lazy* as it is *Suſpicious.* I refer to the Editions, why is he not at the Pains to Examin them, if he juſtly ſuſpects my Account? The Truth is, it is not as Eaſie to *diſprove*, as to *impeach* ones Veracity. The Rector has an excellent Faculty at the latter, let who will undertake the former.

III. " Such Errors don't eſtabliſh any Untruth, nor favour any ſide in the preſent " Controverſies, nor has Mr. *O.* given us one Example of the ſame Error repeated " in ſeveral Editions. *p.* 33.

Where they make a corrupt Senſe, they eſtabliſh an Untruth, as in *Job* 6. 21. *we are nothing*, it ſhould be, *ye are nothing*. There is *we* for *ye*, as in *Acts* 6. 3.

you

you have *ye* for *we*. So that *we* and *ye* are eaſily miſtaken one for another. But the Rector ſeems to have no concern for any Truth, but what reſpects the Biſhops power. Avoid all Corruption that may prejudice that, and this *tender hoofed Creature* (it is his own Expreſſion, *p.* 24.) can eaſily digeſt all the reſt. It was none of my buſineſs to Examin, how often theſe Errors have been repeated, tho' I told him, Remark *p.* 13. *an Error in one Impreſſion is eaſily repeated, becauſe the Frames of the Bible are often kept intire, and not broken by half Sheets, as in printing other Books, and ſo the ſame ſet of Frames ſerves for a ſecond and third Impreſſion, and ſo forward until the Letters decay and grow uſeleſs.*

But this He takes no Notice of.

IV. " An Error of the Preſs deſerves not to be taken to taſk, when no ill Uſe is " made of it.

I know no Body that has made any ill Uſe of *ye* in *Acts* 6. 3. Nor has he yet been able to produce any one Writer among the Diſſenters, that has made Uſe of it againſt the Biſhops. His *Cameronian* Story we ſhall Examin anon.

Does he know what ill Uſe may be made by ignorant People of other Errors of the Preſs?

I took notice in my Remarks, of his looſe and careleſs way of citing Scriptures, and gave *Ten Inſtances* of it in that very Sermon, in which he Charges the Diſſenters with a *literal* Error of the Preſs, which he can't prove upon them. One might have expected more Exactneſs from ſo Critical a *Cenſor*.

To this he Anſwers, " *Jeſus Chriſt* and St. *Paul*, did not tie themſelves to the " very Words of the Scripture in their Quotations, *p.* 34, 35. nor does Mr. *Baxter*. *Jeſus Chriſt* and St. *Paul*, were *infallibly* acted by the Holy Ghoſt in their Quotations and had Reaſons for their Variation: The Rector is not only deſtitute of a Spirit of *Infallibility*, but of ſuch Reaſons as may Juſtify his chopping and changing Texts of Scripture at his Pleaſure. He does not pretend to give any Reaſon why he ſhould miſ-quote ſo many Scriptures within the compaſs of one ſhort Sermon, nor is the thing Capable of any other but this, that the Rector is a very careleſs Tranſcriber of the Scripture

I believe he cannot produce in Mr. *Baxter*, or ſcarſe in any other Author ſo many Texts of Scripture miſ-quoted in one Sermon as there are in his: Much leſs can he give an Inſtance of ſo Supine a Negligence in Mr. *Baxter*, as to miſ-render the Text of his Sermon. This the Rector has done, ſubſtituting the ſingular (Word) *add thou not unto his Word*, for the plural (Words) add thou not unto his *Words*.

I acquitted him from *Corrupting the Senſe*, in this Variation, but gave this neceſſary Caution, *allow Men a liberty of a literal Variation from the Language of the Holy Ghoſt, the Senſe and meaning can't be long ſecured. This he calls a putid and ridiculous Remark.*

The Rector's *ye* and *we* in *Acts* 6. confirms my Remark; the Variation is in one Letter, but the Senſe and Meaning is deſtroy'd by it. Suppoſe a bold Tranſcriber ſhould write *Gods* for *God*, this is a *literal Variation*, but ſuch as deſtroys the *Unity of the God-head.*

CHAP. IV.

Being an Answer to his Fourth Chapter.

IN this Chapter the Rector endavours to confirm his Arguments *to prove the Dissenters guilty of corrupting* Acts 6. 3. His Arguments are four, 1*st*. The Alteration happen'd in 1638. when Presbytery was in the Ascendant. 2*ly*. It favours the Dissenters. 3*ly*. The Episcopal Party design'd not to Corrupt this Place. 4*ly*. A *Cameronian* urged this Corrupt reading.

To his *first* Argument, that the Corruption happen'd in 38. when Presbytery was in the Ascendant, I answered Three Things, *First*, That *two Events may happen at the same time, that have no relation to one another.* " Right, saith he, when there " is nothing else to be alledged for confirming the Suspicion, but the Turbulency of " the Times, the Sway of the Populacy, and the Corruption of this Place: All " looked the same way, *viz*. The *Extirpation of Episcopacy*. p. 36.

The Times were not Turbulent at *Cambridge*, where he saith the first Corruption happen'd, nor was there any *Sway of Populacy there* in the Year 38. *Buck* and *Daniel*, the University Printers at that time, were both Episcopal Men, as I observ'd in my Remarks, but this he takes no Notice of; is it likely that the *Cambridge Episcopal Printers*, should conspire with the *Scotch Covenanters* to root out *Episcopacy* in that Year?

I never understood before, that an Error of the Press had an influence for the Extirpation of Episcopacy. The Rector has not produc'd any one Instance of any *English*, or *Scotch Presbyterians*, who made Use of that Error to the prejudice of *Episcopacy* at that Time. His *Cameronian* Story is a later Thing, and cannot affect those Times.

2. I observ'd, that the Rector had answer'd his own Argument by acknowledging the first Corruption an *unwilling One*, an *accidental Slip*, an *unfortunate Over-sight*, a *meer Error of the Press* and an *unhappy Mistake*.

In answer to this he cries, *My Remarks are all of a Thrid, Lies and Stories, that by the* unwilling Error *he meant the Presbyterian Government* p. 36.

Be it so, all that can be infer'd from it is, that I mistook his Meaning, which a Man may easily do in a Writer, whose Notions are confused and incoherent, and way of Expression muddy and perplex'd. But he cannot deny, that he has call'd it an *accidental Slip*, an *unfortunate Over-sight*, a *meer Error of the Press*, and an *unhappy Mistake*, which is sufficient to overthrow his Argument.

True saith he, yet unto the two first I added, *I am willing to believe*, &c.

The Remarks were just now with him all of a *Thrid*, *Lies and Stories*, and yet in the same Breath, he cannot but acknowledge my Quotations to be *True*. *If* they *are all Lies and Stories*, there is no Truth in them, but some Things are *True*, by his own Confession; therefore he is inexcusable, for wherein he Judgeth another, he Condemns himself. As *Diogenes* trampled upon *Plato*'s Pride with a greater Pride, so the Rector exhibits a *lying Accusation* against my Remarks, that they are all *Lies and Stories*.

But he qualified some of his other Concessions, by saying, he was willing to believe, *that the first Corruption was an unfortunate Over-sight* and a *meer Error of Press*. If he is *willing to believe* this himself, what a disingenuous Thing is it in him to endeavour to persuade others to the *Contrary*? The design of his Argument is to make

make People believe the first Corruption in 38. was a designed Thing to root out Episcopacy. Is this the Part of an *honest Man* Mr. Rector, to persuade the World to believe what's contrary to your own Belief? I hope all your Sermons are not of a Piece with this, you must not blame us for believing as you do, that the Error you Charge us with was an *unfortunate Over-sight* and a *meer Error of the Press*, and then your Argument is out of Doors: Especially, when you positively Affirm, that it was an *accidental Slip*, an *unhappy Mistake*. Thus his first and chief Argument is eternally dismissed by himself, and his Attempts to defend it, do but shew the Rector to be as *ill* a *Man*, as he is a *Disputant*. To be willing to believe us Innocent, and at the same time to endeavour to prove us Guilty, be-speaks a Disposition worse than that of *Pilate*, who tho' he condemn'd *Jesus Christ*, when he had pronounced him *Innocent*, did not seek for Evidence to prove him *Guilty*, he contented himself to give an *unjust Sentence* to please the *Jews*: But the Rector did not seem to be under the temptation of pleasing his own Party, who were so far from extorting this unjust Sentence from him, that several of them have condemn'd him for it; yet he has not only passed an unrighteous Judgment upon us, but has done his utmost to load us with an *unproved Guilt*, after he had made our Crime, an *accidental Slip*, and *unhappy Mistake*.

3. I prov'd, *ex abundanti*, that Presbytery was not in the Ascendant in *England* in 38. That conformity was then at the highest, being urged by *Arch Bishop Laud* and his Faction with great Severity, that many were suspended, deprived and excommunicated for not reading the *Book of Sports*, in 37.

I gave an Account of about Thirty Ministers so used in the Bishoprick of *Norwich*. And in 38. many more were Suspended for not using *Hoods and Surplices*, many were driven to foreign Countries, to *Holland*, *New-England*, &c. whither the Arch-Bishop design'd to pursue 'em, and to *Dragoon* 'em into the *English* Conformity: I prov'd they were deprived not only of the *Pulpit*, but of the *Press* also by a *Decree* passed in the *Star Chamber*, *July the* 1st, 1637. By Virtue of this Decree, several *Geneva* Bibles with Notes were seized in *Holland*, and a New Impression design'd for *England*, was stop'd from coming over. All this I prov'd out of *Rushworth* and *Heylyn*, by which it appears what little Credit is to be given to his secret History of the Presbyterians Corrupting the Word of God in Thirty Eight, when he so notoriously Contradicts the *Publick History* of that Time.

To this the Rector Answers, *He wou'd not for any Thing be found tripping in this Part of his Argument.* p, 37.

That Mr. Owen *blunders about the signification of these Words*, being in the Ascendant, *which he understands of being in full Power and Authority, as if it were the same with having the Ascendant: And* least you should think him *an* Ignoramus in the Mathematicks, *he informs us out of* Lyburn, *when a Star is said to be* in the Ascendant, *which is, when having passed the* Imum Cæli, *and being got into the the Ascendant, it bends it's course towards* Medium Cæli *and the Meridian*, i. e. *is Ascending.*

I hope you are Edified by this Piece of Learning: *A Star is in the Ascendant*, when it is got into the *Ascendant*, and is *Ascending*: This puts me in Mind of that famous Verse of *Battus* the Poet,

Montibus, inquit, erant, & erant in montibus illis;

Which you may thus *English*, in conformity to the Rector:

The Mountains high he did Ascend,
Ascending still, he did Ascend.

His

His Explications are *tranſcendent Blunders*, which wou'd have been more Excuſable, if he had not ſet up for a *Teacher* of the *Mathematicks*, and involv'd a learned Author in a *tautological Pleonaſm.*

The Rectors diſtinction between *being in the Aſcendant, and having the Aſcendant* is a little Nice, he owns Preſbytery had not the Aſcendant in Thirty Eight, and yet Affirms it *was got into the Aſcendant.* But the happineſs is, this Diſtinction will do him no good, for my Argument proves Preſbytery to be ſo far from the *Aſcendant* in his very Senſe, that it makes it to be in the *Deſcendant* in *England* that Year. Epiſcopacy was never higher, nor Preſbytery lower. The Epiſcopal Power was in its *Meridian Altitude*, having the *High Commiſſion-Court* and the *Star-Chamber* to ſupport it, and an Active *Arch-Prelate* moving in the *higheſt Orb*, whoſe Influences were as *Malignant* to the *Puritans* (the better Part of the Church of England then) as they were *favourable* to the Men of *Ceremony.* In a Word, he had the *Presbyterians* (if any ſuch there were) under his Feet, and made this *Climate* too hot for them, that they were glad to ſeek for ſhelter in the remoteſt Parts of the Earth. This I have prov'd out of *Heylyn*, but the Rector wiſely overlooks it. If being under Foot and trampled in the duſt be *Aſcending* towards the *Meridian*, then were the *Presbyterians* in the *Aſcendant* in Thirty Eight. If bending their Courſe *verſus fines terræ*, be the ſame with bending it *verſus medium Cæli*, they muſt be acknowledg'd to be in the *Aſcendant.*

But ſaith he, *That prodigious and terrible* blazing Star, *the* Covenant, *that very Year* begun *to appear in* Scotland, *and ſoon drew the Eyes and Inclinations of a great Part of* England *upon it.* p. 37.

The Covenant appear'd in *Scotland* long before Thirty Eight, and was ſubſcribed by King *James* I. as I ſhew'd in my Remarks. *p.* 8.

The renewing of the Covenant in Thirty Eight, proves Preſbytery to be in the *Aſcendant* in *Scotland*, but what is this to *England*? Preſbytery is now in the *Meridian* in *Scotland*, I hope the Rector will not ſay it is ſo in *England.* It muſt be ſo by his Argument, He undertook to prove Preſbytery in the *Aſcendant* in *England*, and his Argument is, it was ſo in *Scotland*, as if the State of *England* and *Scotland* were always the ſame. Lets ſee the Strength of this *doughty* Argument, the *Presbyterian Covenant* appear'd in *Scotland* in Thirty Eight, therefore the *Presbyterians* at *Cambridge* corrupted the Bible. Did the *Scotch Covenant* depend upon altering of *we* into *ye* at *Cambridge*, or did the Alteration depend on the *Covenant*? Was there a Conſpiracy between the *Scotch Covenanters*, and the *Cambridge Epiſcopal Printers.*

Suppoſe the *Covenant* drew the Inclinations of ſome *Engliſh*, this does not prove *Presbytery* in the *Aſcendant* in *England*, much leſs does it prove the Preſbyterians Guilty of Corrupting the Word of God. A Man may have Inclinations to *Presbytery*, and not be a Corrupter of the Word of God.------

Thus the Rector *who wou'd not for any Thing be found tripping in this Part of his Argument*, is found not only to Trip, but to Stumble and overthrow his Rider, when he affirms Preſbytery to be in the Aſcendant in Thirty Eight, in *England.* But ſuppoſe *Presbytery* had been *in the Aſcendant* then, this will not prove the Preſbyterians Authors of that Corruption; 1*ſt.* It does not favour their Principles. 2*ly.* Arch-Biſhop *Laud* had guarded the Preſs againſt them, as I have prov'd, nor was the Rector able to Contradict me. 3*ly.* the *Cambridge* Printers in Thirty Eight, were *Epiſcopal Men*, who ought in Juſtice to be charged with the Errors of the Preſs. 4*ly.* The Univerſity of *Cambridge* was far from being Preſbyterian at that time, the Heads of Colledges being all Epiſcopal, a Liſt of which Mr. *Francis Talents* communicated to me, which I find agreeing with Mr. *Fullers* *. To this

* *Church Hiſtory.*

the

the Rector Answers, " That Mr. *Owen* talks like one who knows not *Cambridge*. Nor had diligence enough to inform himself, and Mr. *Talents*, he fears is past his *Memory* and *Judgment* not to say his *Integrity*. *p.* 37. 39.

Mr. *Owen* has known *Cambridge* above twenty Years ago when he was admitted Student there, Mr. *Talents* Judgment, Memory and Integrity deserves not to be reflected on, since Mr. *Fuller* in his History of the University of *Cambridge* fully writes the same thing he mention'd.

But saith he, *besides these sixteen Heads, there are Fellows, Scholars, Noble-men, Fellow-Commoners, Persioners and Sisars or Servitors, which make up about 2000, among which there were many that favour'd* Presbytery, *especially in* Emanuel, *which not long after furnished six Colledges with Heads, and it was call'd* pure Emanuel, *from the abundance of* Puritans *in it.* p. 39.

The Rector informs us of what every body knows, that there are a great many Students in *Cambridge*, and if he can find there five or six *Presbyterians* among two Thousand Scholars, he thinks he has prov'd his Charge against that Party of Corrupting the Word of God. This puts me in Mind of a Passage in *Lactantius*, He saith, that as *Diocletian* was Sacrificing, and the *ordinary Marks* in the *Intrailes* of the *Sacrifices* not appearing, Tages, *that were set over the* Diviners, *said, that their Rites did not succeed, because there were some prophane Persons* (i. e. *Christians*) *that had thrust themselves into the Assembly.* * This occasion'd the last and great Persecution of the Christians under that Emperour and his Collegues. The Rector is as just to the *Puritans*, as the *Pagan Priests* were to the Ancient *Christians*, their being *upon the spot* is sufficient to make the one and the other Criminals. Thus St. *Paul* was Accused for bringing *Greeks* into the *Temple*, and the Evidence was, they had seen *Trophimus* with him in the City. *Acts* 21. 28, 29.

I have heard of a certain late Judge, that as he passed a dirty Place in *London* Streets, he found a Man sheltring himself under a Balcony from a Shower of Rain. Sir, saith he, to the Man *I will have you indited for this Nusance.* The Man told him, he was a Stranger there, that's nothing, replies the Judg, *I have found you on the Premisses*, and you must Answer for the *Nusance*.

The Rector thinks he has found a few *Puritans* in *Cambridge* in Thirty Eight, among near two Thousand Church-men, and they must be Guilty of the *Corruptive Nusance*, because he has *found 'em on the Premisses*.

But that which spoiles all is, the *Puritans* were Members of the Church of *England*, and generally of the *Episcopal Judgment*, nay the Moderate and Pious *Bishops* cou'd not escape that *Nick-name*, which was applied to all *Calvinists* in Doctrine, as Dr. *Heylyn* confesseth. † Tho' in strictness the Name was given to the *Non-con-formists*, which were very few at that time, the Terms of Conformity not being screw'd up to the present height.

But the Heads of Colledges were no *Puritans*, no not Dr. *Haldsworth* Master of *Emanuel*, who was put out by the Parliament; and any Man will judge of the State of the University, and indeed of all Societies, by the *Governing Party*, who have a considerable Influence in their respective Provinces. If *Cambridge* supplied *Trinity Colledge*, *Oxford*, with ten Fellows that were for the Parliament (as he affirms *p.* 39.) It does not follow they were *Presbyterians* before, for we know its usual for abundance of People to change with the Times; I doubt not but the Rector can Name the Men

* *Lactant of the Prim. Pers. Engl. by Dr.* Burnet. *p.* 75. † *Life of Arch-Bishop* Laud. *p.* 124.

who took the *Covenant* and the *Engagement*; and after all, approv'd themſelves to be right *Epiſcopal*-Men. Beſides, many of thoſe that were made Fellows at *Oxford* in the Year 1638. were very Young, and not admitted in *Cambridge* till after 1648.

From the whole it appears that Preſbytery in Thirty Eight, was not in the *Aſcendant* in *England*, eſpecially in *Cambridge* where all the Heads of Colledges were *Epiſcopal*.

Thus I have expos'd the weak Vindication of his Firſt Argument from the *Circumſtance* of *Time*.

I affirm'd the *Scotch Covenant* and the *Presbyterian* Government in *Scotland* to be more Ancient than Thirty Eight, which the Rector cannot deny, but he endeavours to prove from the *Fundamental Charter of Presbyter examin'd*, &c. that *the Reformation in* Scotland *was firſt caſt into the Epiſcopal Platform, and continued ſo for fifteen Years.* *p.* 40.

The Pamphlet to which he refers, has been learnedly anſwer'd by Dr. *Rule* in his *good old Way defended*, to which I refer the Reader.

The Reformation there was gradually, and with much oppoſition carried on, as it was here in *England*, and no wonder, if in ſuch a ſtruggle *Eſau* came forth before *Jacob*, but certain it is, when they came to ſome degree of Settlement, Preſbytery was ſet up, and the *confeſſion of Faith*, in which they promiſed to ad-here to that Government, was ſign'd by King *James* the I. and his Houſhold, *Anno* 1580. and by Perſons of all Ranks *Anno* 1581. by Ordinance of the Council, and Acts of the *General Aſſembly*. It was ſubſcribed again by all Perſons, *Anno Domini* 1590. with a *General Band* for maintenance of the true Religion and the Kings Perſon.

"I am ſtill of Opinion (ſaith he), That the *Scotch Kirk* put away the Wife of "its Youth, I mean Epiſcopacy, when it reform'd from Popery, and joyn'd it ſelf "unto an Harlot (I mean *Presbytery*).

I think *Presbytery* as *Honeſt* as *Epiſcopacy*, and I am ſure the Church loſt it's purity, and degenerated into a *Harlot*, under the Lordly and Tyranical Government of *Popiſh Biſhops*. *p.* 41.

What an honourable Character does this Gentleman give to the Reformation, in which not only *Scotland*, but moſt of the forreign Proteſtant Churches are concern'd? When they caſt off *Idolatrous Popiſh Biſhops*, they put away the Wife of their Youth; when they put themſelves under the Conduct of *Proteſtant Paſtors*, they joyn'd themſelves to a *Harlot*. In plain *Engliſh*, they lived in chaſt Wedlock under Popery, and *defiled* the Marriage-bed, when they became Proteſtants. This looks more like the Language of a *Jeſuit* than of a Proteſtant-Miniſter.

The Rector, in his Sermon baſely reflected upon the ACT of Settling *Presbytery in Scotland* (tho' touched by the *Royal Scepter*), and alſo upon his Majeſties Words in his Letter of Inſtructions to his *Commiſſioner* in *Scotland*, both which affirms Preſbytery *moſt agreeable to the Inclination of the* Scotch *Nation*, which is ſuch another Reaſon (ſaith he) as an *Adulterer* might give for his *Wantonneſs*. He would fain Palliate this *inexcuſable Indecency* towards the King (which I complain'd of) tho' he comes off but ſorrily.

1ſt. "This is the firſt time (ſaith he), I ever heard of a *Presbyterian* having any "due regard unto a Kings Honour, and perhaps it will be the laſt, if the Com-"monwealth Principle gets a little more footing among us. *p.* 41.

The *Presbyterians* have approv'd themſelves to be as Good Subjects as any of their Neighbours, both in this and neighbouring Countries; for the neighbouring Countries let him aſk the *French Proteſtants*, and the perſecuted *Vaudois*: For *this*, let him conſult their *Confeſſions*, which aſſert Obedience and Subjection to the Higher Powers. I have known ſeveral *Presbyterians* who had that regard to a *Kings Honour*, as

to

to quit all their Preferments rather then take the *Engagement*, to exclude the King, when many *Episcopal Men* submitted to it. It's true, they generally took Part with the *Parliament* in our unhappy Civil Wars, and so did abundance of Church-Men: But *Passive Obedience* and *Non-resistance* in 1688. have eminently justified *Forty One*.

If the Republican Principle gets footing, its amongst some of his *Jacobite Brethren*, who under Colour of that Principle wou'd promote the Intereſt of their Old Maſter. I know not any one Preſbyterian who is for a *Commonwealth*: I confeſs, they are not for making Princes Abſolute, as the Rector is, who declares that the *King's* Coronation Oath *is a voluntary Act of Grace, unto which the King is not obliged by the Fundamental Conſtitution, and that the Prince, in Effect, is the* ſole ſovereign Power, *if he pleaſeth to* uſurp *and* exerciſe it *.

2*ly*. " 'Tis no reflection on the King (adds he) to deride the *Scots* Reaſon. " The *Scotch* Parliament Reaſon for the ACT was their *Inclination*; the King was " to pleaſe them.

I ſay, 'tis a reflection on the *King* to deride their Reaſon, when he had approv'd it, and inſerted it into his Letter of Inſtructions to his *Commiſſioner* in *Scotland*. The *Letters of Princes* and their *Laws* confirm'd in *Parliament*, ought to be treated with more Reſpect, or at leaſt with leſs Scorn, eſpecially by a Perſon who not only enjoys his Preferments under His Majeſties *Protection*, but hath taught us ſuch an intire reſignation to the *Will* of the Sovereign, that he allows us not the Liberty *of Petitioning and Addreſſing him*, when we are *Aggrieved*. Nay, we are bound in Conſcience to obey, tho' he ſhou'd prove a *Tyrant*, and it's an *Act of Grace* in him to oblige himſelf *to govern according to the Laws*: For he is the *ſole Sovereign Power, and is accountable to none but God for any Miſgovernment*. In a Word, he gives the Prince the moſt *Arbitrary Power*, and deprives the *Subject from aſſerting his own Priviledges* †.

For ſuch a Man to deride the *Acts of his Prince*, looks not only *Ungrateful* and *Inconſiſtent*, but may tempt us to ſuſpect, that either he does not *believe* his own *Doctrine*, or elſe that he Calculated it for the *Epiſcopal Meridian*; that is, whilſt Princes ſupport *Epiſcopacy*, which I dare ſay, is agreeable to his *Inclination*, we are to honour and obey them; but if they Favour *Presbytery* we may *deride* their *Letters* and *Royal Acts*. In a Word, whilſt the King pleaſes the Rectors *Inclinations* he is his *Humble Slave*, and will allow him an *un-bounded Power*; but if he comply with the *Scotch Inclination*, our *Loyal Rector* dare deride the *Reaſon* of his Compliance, and ridicule his *Royal Wiſdom*, under pretence of expoſing the *Scots Reaſon*. 'Tis pity but this Gentleman had been of his Majeſties Council, to adviſe him how to Pen his *Letters*, and to inſtruct him how to Word his *Inſtructions* to his Prime Miniſters of State.

ARGUMENT II.

His 2d. Argument *to prove the* Diſſenters *Guilty of* Corrupting *the* Word *of* God, *is this*, The Corruption in appearance favours the *Diſſenters*, and their Deſign, againſt *Epiſcopacy*.

TO this *Argument* I anſwer'd three Things,

1*ſt*. He durſt not ſay, the Corruption *favours* the *Diſſenters*, for he knows the Contrary: But he ſlily ſays it does in appearance favour them; this *appearance* is only to himſelf, for I believe no *Diſſenter* ever thought of it. This he takes no notice of.

* *Serm. of Subjection, by the Rector of* Bury, *p.* 21, 22. † *Serm. of Subj. p.* 13. 21, 22.

2*ly*. I told him that I knew no Principle of any ſober Diſſenters, that is favoured by this Corruption. I refer'd him to the *Directory* for *Ordination*, and the *Heads* of *Agreement* between the *Presbyterians* and *Congregational Men* in (1691.) in both which the Power of Ordination is lodged in the Miniſters, and not in the People, to whom they aſcribe only the Power of Chuſing them, according to this very Text (*Acts* 6. 3.) and the Rector's concurrent Teſtimony, if that were of any Validity *.

He allows the People as much Power in making their Miniſter as the Diſſenters do, and therefore by this Argument, muſt either acquit them, or condemn himſelf.

Here the *Water ſticks* to the Rector, he knows not which way to turn him about, rather than retract his malicious Calumny, like a Man hardoned in Sin, he'l make uſe of any ſorry ſhift to *Paliate his Guilt*, and Expoſe the Innocent.

He cannot deny this to be the Judgment of the Diſſenters, that *Ordination* belongs to *Miniſters*, and Election ordinarily to the *People*. But ſaith he, "among "us the Biſhop *Inſtitutes* and *Appoints* by an Act altogether diſtinct from *Ordination*, "as we *believe* was the Caſe of the *Deacons*: But among the Diſſenters the Paſtors "Ordain, and the People chuſe and appoint 'em. *p*. 43.

He may *believe* what he pleaſes, but the Text mentions no other Appointment of the Apoſtles, but what was by *Prayer* and *Impoſition* of *Hands*, *Acts* 6. 3, 6. which he cannot deny to be meant of *Ordination*.

He diſingenuouſly miſ-repreſents us, when he ſays the People *Chuſe* and *Appoint*, they *Chuſe* indeed, but the Miniſters *Appoint* or *Ordain* 'em to the *Office*, which they very rarely or never do *Sine Titulo*.

I noted, that the Diſſenters cou'd be under no Temptation to Corrupt this Place, the Peoples power of chuſing their Miniſters being aſſerted in this very Text, *Acts* 6. 3. Look ye out *among* you, &c. and *v*. 5. *they choſe Stephen*, &c.

To this he ridiculouſly replies, "they choſe not the Perſons immediately into the "Office deſign'd them. *p*. 44.

The *Presbyterians* never aſſerted ſuch an *Election*, which he cannot but know, though he thinks fit to abuſe them. The Peoples choice does not appoint or eſtabliſh 'em in their Office, nor oblige the Miniſters to ordain 'em, if they judge them not duly qualified.———

As to his granting the Peoples power of chuſing their Miniſters, he ſays, "he "is of the ſame Opinion ſtill, being under no *neceſſity* to alter it, that he is ſen-"ſible of.

I know not what changes in Opinion, his *Neceſſities* may oblige him to, but if his Argument or any other *Neceſſity* require it, it ſeems he can *change* as there is Occaſion.

It is certain at preſent he allows the People as much Power in chuſing their Miniſters as we do: And therefore this Corruption does no more favour us, than it does the Rector, who muſt either honeſtly acquit us or condemn himſelf.

3*ly*. I obſerv'd farther, that the Diſſenters look on the VII. Deacons, as Miniſters at Tables, and not of the Word. For proof of this I refer'd him to the *Directory*, and infer'd that it is not likely they ſhou'd Corrupt a Text to aſſert the *Peoples power* in making *Goſpel Miniſters*, which in *their Opinion* ſpeaks not of thoſe that *Miniſter* in Goſpel *Myſteries*.

The Rector anſwers, "I can't help theſe Men's *Judgments* if they do not, or will "not ſee it, 'tis becauſe *there is no light in them*. *p*. 45.

Nor can I help this Mans *Obſtinacy* who ſhuts his Eyes againſt the *Light*, for the queſtion is not here, whether the *Diſſenters* be in the Right, as to their Opinion

* *Tent. Novum. p*. 4.

of

of *Deacons*, but whether or no they take 'em as *Miniſters of Tables* and not of the Word?

This I prov'd and he cannot deny it: Now if this be their Notion of *Deacons*, my Inference holds good, *they wou'd not Corrupt a Text* to aſſert the Peoples power, in making Goſpel Miniſters *which in their Opinion ſpeaks not of thoſe that Miniſter in Goſpel Myſteries.*

His Argument is, the Corruption favours the *Diſſenters*, I anſwer in the Negative, for which I give this Reaſon, this Text ſpeaks not of *Miniſters of the Word* in their Opinion, and therefore they wou'd not Corrupt it to aſſert the Peoples power in making *Miniſters*. Here he aſks us an impertinent Queſtion, why do we not *Ordain* our *Deacons*, or *Overſeeres* of the Poor as the Apoſtles did? *p.* 45.

We ſet them not apart by impoſition of Hands, for the ſame Reaſon that the Church of England Ordains them not. None will ſay, that we are neceſſarily obliged to uſe *Impoſition of Hands* in all caſes wherein we find it uſed in Scripture. Tho' we condemn not thoſe that *Ordain* their *Deacons*, as ſome Diſſenters do.

I have now diſmiſs'd his 2*d*. Argument, and made it appear that the *Corruption* charged upon us does not only not favour any *Principles* of ours, but is inconſiſtent with 'em.

Before I proceed to his 3*d*. Argument, I muſt take notice of a baſe Suggeſtion, *as if I had not obtain'd my former Poſte at* Wr. *by fair and honeſt Means, but had betrayed, and by a paultrey Trick ſupplanted* Mr. B. *my Predeceſſor, and ſtept into his Place, and diſcovered the Secrets of my inward Friend and Confident, who diſcloſed his Heart to me as to a Confeſſor.* p. 45.

I was ſo far from ſupplanting and betraying Mr. *B.* at *Wr.* that I knew nothing of the Difference between him and the Congregation, which occaſion'd his *Deſerting* them, until Mr. *Tong* (now of *Coventry*) was actually choſen by them, and reſided with them, I being then in *London*. And my Poſte there has been and is hitherto Charitably to ſupply 'em, and that moſtly to my Charge, until they be ſettl'd under a Miniſter of their own.

I have often recommended Mr. *B.* to them, but for ſome Reaſons I find 'em not willing to be farther concern'd with him.

I know of no Secrets he ever Committed to me, and I challenge him or any other Perſon to mention any Secrets I ever Divulged to his Prejudice. I always reſpected him for his true Worth, but we never had any great Intimacy or inward Friendſhip, to make me either his *Confident* or *Confeſſor*.

ARGUMENT III.

His 3*d*. Argument *is this, It cannot be that the* Epiſcopal Party *deſign'd to Corrupt this Place, for that would be to deſtroy, what their Church Government ſeems to be built on.*

I Anſwer'd, this proves nothing againſt the *Diſſenters*, nor did they charge the *Epiſcopal Party* with any deſign of Corrupting it, tho' the Preſs was in their Hands, and ſtrictly guarded againſt the *Puritans* in the Year 1638.

The Rector according to his wonted Ingenuity replies, *if it were deſignedly done, or afterwards propagated with deſign, then becauſe Mr.* Owen *acquitted us, the* Diſſenters *muſt confeſs Guilty.* p. 46.

Is this Candid, becauſe we charitably acquit the Epiſcopal Party from any Deſign of Corrupting it, we muſt therefore acknowledge our ſelves Guilty.

We do not ſay it was *deſignedly* done, nor do I know any body that ſays ſo (and un-ſaith it again in another humour) but the inconſiſtent Rector. We ſay the Preſs was in the Hands of the Church-Party when it was firſt done, and therefore in Juſtice

ſtice they muſt be charg'd with the Error of the Preſs. Had the Preſs been in *Presbyterian* Hands, the Rector wou'd have urged it for a Demonſtration, that certainly they were Guilty of the Corruption, becauſe it firſt happen'd when they had the Power of the Preſs: But the Preſs was in *Epiſcopal* Hands, therefore the Corruption muſt be at their Door.

If one would allow himſelf the Liberty of Arguing from the ſame Topicks with the Rector, he might retort the Charge of Corrupting this Place on the *Epiſcopal* Party, and that deſignedly too. *1ſt.* The Preſs was in their Hands in Thirty Eight, when the firſt Corruption happen'd. *2ly.* It was in their Hands, when moſt of the reſt happen'd, and who ſhould be Guilty of Corrupting the Place, but thoſe that had Power to do it, without Suſpicion? *3ly.* The Corruption favours the Peoples Power in making their own *Miniſters*. Now it's certain, the Epiſcopal Party take the Deacons in *Acts* 6. 3. to be *real Miniſters*, which the *Diſſenters* do not: Therefore the Corruption favours their Opinion, and they may be ſuppoſed the Guilty Perſons. It does not favour the *Diſſenters* Sence of that Place, and it does that of the *Epiſcopaliſts*. 4. It favours a Principle much in Vogue among the Church-Party, eſpecially about Thirty Eight, that all *Power is Originally in the People*.

This Principle is aſſerted by Mr. *Hooker*, the Oracle of the Epiſcopal-Men, in his *Eccleſ. Polity*, lib. 1. and lib. 8.

Arch-Biſhop *Cranmer*, *ſaith in the* New Teſtament, *he that is appointed to be a* Biſhop *or a* Preſbyter, *needs no Conſecration by the Scripture*, *for* Election *or* Appointing * *thereto is ſufficient*.

And alſo by Biſhop *Bilſon*, and by Mr. *Lawſon*, who expreſly Affirms that the πρῶτον δέκτικον or primary Subject of the Power of the Keys is in the whole Church. † And by Biſhop *Andrews*, *Tortura Torti*, p. 42.

Now who ſhould be ſuſpected to have deſignedly Corrupted this Place, but that Party who ſo much advance the *Popular Principle*?

Here is *Four* Arguments to the Rectors *Four* Arguments, and every one of them as good as his, but far be it from me to Charge either the *Epiſcopal* or *Diſſenting* Party with a Deſign to Corrupt the Word of God. The *Error* is *accidental* as many more are, and proceeds from the careleſsneſs of the Corrector (who I hear is uſually an *Epiſcopal* Miniſter) as well as the unconcernedneſs of the *ſupreme Paſtors*, who ought to depute Perſons of Judgment, Diligence and Integrity to Examine the ſeveral *Editions* of the *Bible*.

I cou'd eaſily enlarge upon theſe Arguments, and make 'em look more Probable than thoſe of the Rectors, if I were under the influences of a malignant Jealouſy and a ſuſpicious Un-charitableneſs as he is, or took pleaſure in the *ſordid Act* of expoſing a Party to the common Prejudice of Religion, as he doth. But I leave this *Artifice* to our *ill-natured Accuſer*, and only mention theſe Things, to ſhew the Invalidity of his Arguments, and what an eaſy Thing it is for a Perſon, who imploys his Talent to ſo ill an Intention, to form *probable Arguments* that may ground a Suſpicion, that the *Epiſcopal Party are Corrupters of the Word of God*: And it wou'd not be impoſſible to pick up two or three *idle Stories*, to confirm ſo malicious a Charge, as the Rector has done, which make up his fourth Argument,

---

* *Dr.* Stillingfleet, *Iren.* p. 39. † *Polit. Sacra, & Civil. cap.* 13.

ARGUMENT IV.

This 4th. Argument, *is deduced from the* Cameronian's *citing this Corrupt Place in favour of the Peoples Power, to set up their own Teachers.*

TO this I answer'd, 1*st*. The Story concerns not the *English Presbyterians*. Does our Accuser manage his Evidence with common Honesty? He puts in a Charge against the Body of English Dissenters, and brings in for Guilty a single *Scotch Cameronian*.

2*ly*. The *Scotch* Evidence is, by hear-say, without Name, Person, Time or Place. He promised a good *circumstantial Proof*, *Serm. p.* 23. and he gives us one Divested of all it's *Circumstances*.

3*ly*. It's scarce Credible, that a Cameronian should assert a Doctrine contrary to the *Presbyterian Principles*.

4*ly*. Suppose some ignorant *Cameronian* had been abused, or had abused others by this Corrupt reading------ must the Error of one Man be charged on the whole Church of *Scotland*? And must the Error of one *Scotch*-Man be charged on all the *English Presbyterians*? This is such a piece of Justice, as none will defend, but a *Haman*, who seeks to be reveng'd upon all the *Jews*, because one *Mordecai* had offended.

The Rector replies,

1*st*. That for Matter of Fact, he thinks it unquestionable, " 'tis thus; The ho- " nourable Collonel *Fairfax*, reported this Fact to Mr. *Piggot* Vicar of *Rochdale*, in " the hearing of several, in particular of Mr. *Robert Milne*, a Dissenter: And find- " ing several *English* Bibles, which were sent from private Houses, Corrupted, de- " clared, that he thought the *Presbyterians* had some knavish Design. A *German* " Gentleman in the company pull'd a *Dutch Testament of Luther*'s Translation out of " his Pocket, wherein he read *we*, and added, he was certain the Presbyterians in " *Germany* and in *Scotland* (where he had lately been) were *Knaves*, and it was " well if they were better in *England*. *p.* 47.

This Account does not make the *Cameronian*-Tale a whit the more Credible, because.

1*st*. It it uncertain whether Coll. *Fairfax* reported it. Mr. *Milne* who is made a Party to this Story, Affirms he never was in Company with Coll. *Fairfax*, nor did he see him when he was at *Rochdale*, being from home that day, so that the Report depends upon the single Testimony of Mr. *Piggot*, which how far it will pass, I leave to those to judge who know the Man, and the manner of his Conversation.

2*ly*. If Coll. *Fairfax* reported it, it does not at all make it unquestionable, for it is but a single Evidence, nor does he say, he heard the *Cameronian* himself urge this Corrupt reading, perhaps the Story passed twenty Hands before it reach'd him; nor does he Name the *Person*, or *Place*, or *Time*, which are shrew'd Evidences, that the Story is Spurious. Such a blind Evidence as this, would look ridiculous in a Court of Justice, but serves the Rector's turn, who does not pretend to observe the troublesome *Forms of Justice* in the Management of his *Charge*.

3*ly*. This Story seems to have been the Entertainment *over their Cups* (where every thing that is said is not Gospel), for as he tells us, they *sent for Bibles from private Houses*: One may conclude then they were now at a *Publick House*.

This confirms the Truth of what I suspected in my *Remarks*, p. 12. That he had pick'd up a spurious Story, perhaps in the next *Coffee-House*, or *Ale-House*, and this he legitimates and recommends from the Pulpit, as a *Sacred Oracle of God*. The

Rector

Rector muſt needs Grace the Pulpit, when he borrows *Materials* for his *Sermons* out of the *Cann-Office*.

4*ly*. His *German* Gentleman is a Stranger, and wants a Voucher for his Veracity, but by his own Account one may ſuſpect he had been in *Scotland* aſſiſting at the *Barbarous Butcheries* there, and *Dragooning* the *Presbyterians* into Conformity: However it be, he charges not the *German* Presbyteriaas, no nor the *Scotch* with Corrupting the Word of God, tho' he complements 'em with the Title of *Knaves*. Who he means by the *Presbyterians* in *Germany* is doubtful, for there are no *Proteſtant Biſhops* there of the *Engliſh Species*. If one may judge *ex Ungue Leonem*, this *German* was a *Popiſh Soldier of Fortune*, and condemns all the *German Proteſtants* for *Knaves*: Or he was a bigotted *Lutheran*, and lov'd the *Calviniſts* as the Rector does the *Presbyterians*. Is not the Rector aſhamed to creep into *Ale-Houſes*, and there to muſter up *Red-Coats* if not *Papiſts* for Evidence againſt us? He brings for Evidence againſt the *Engliſh*, a *Scotch Cameronian*, he brings for Evidence againſt the *Scotch* a *German Papiſt*. Moſt Noble Rector! Your way of proving Matters of Fact is very Singular, you prove your *Cameronian* Story by one ſingle Witneſs, and what he Depoſes is by hear-ſay: You prove the *German* and *Scotch* Presbyterians to be all *Knaves* by another ſingle Witneſs and he an out-landiſh one. We need not go as far as *Germany* for Witneſſes to prove you *Knaviſh* in the Management of your Charge. So much of his *Cameronian* STORY.

He has the Impudence to defend his Imputing the unproved Error of one *Cameronian* to all the *Engliſh Presbyterians*. " Thus, ſaith he, *Haman*'s Offence was " reveng'd upon many Thouſands of Perſons, and *Sauls* upon Seven of his Children, " and the *Note-maker* fell foul upon the whole Body of the Epiſcopal Church, for " a ſuppoſed Fault of my Lord Biſhop of *Salisbury*. p. 48.

The *Jews* deſtroying ſo many Thouſands of Perſons, was not to revenge *Haman*'s Offence, but to defend themſelves againſt thoſe that aſſaulted them, as is expreſly affirm'd in *Eſth*. 8. 11. and 9. 2. The Rector is ſo taken up with *Cameronian* Stories, that he is not at leiſure to acquaint himſelf with Scripture Hiſtory.

It's true *Seven of Saul*'s *Sons were hang'd up unto the Lord* (to whom they had forfeited their Lives) at the deſire of the *Gibeonites*, whom *Saul* had deſtroy'd contrary to the *Oath of God*: But what is this to the imputing of the Error of one Man, whoſe Name no body knows, to all the Presbyterians of *England* and *Scotland*? The Rector is good at proving, I wou'd adviſe him to pick up ſome other Story to prove all the *Presbyterians* of both Nations, to be the Natural Off-ſpring of this *Cameronian*, and when he has done ſo, let him play the *Gibeonite*, and *hang them up* with the Sons of *Saul*. 'Tis well we are not at this Man's Mercy; the very *Gibeonites* contented themſelves with Seven of *Saul*'s Sons, but the Rector as if he were of the Remnant of *Amaleck*, ſeeks with *Haman* to revenge the Fault of *One* upon a whole Party.

The *Note-maker* from whom he wou'd borrow a Plea for his *Injuſtice*, will do him no Service, for he does not Charge any *Perſonal Fault* of the Biſhop of *Salisbury* upon the whole Body of the *Epiſcopal Church*. He only take occaſion (as far as I remember for it's ſome time ſince I read him) from the *Biſhops* charging the Diſſenters with *Schiſm*, to retort it upon the Church, which he thinks Guilty of it.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Containing a reply to his Fifth Chapter.

HAVING anſwer'd his Four Arguments I offered more Conſiderations to ſhew the Falſity of the Rectors Charge, as *1ſt.* No *Proteſtant Diſſenters have ever urged that corrupt reading in favour of a Popular Government of the Church in their Writings. Let him produce, if he can, any one Argument ſupported by this falſe reading in all their Writings.*

All that the Rector pretends to ſay to this, is, " That it is a bold Touch, to be " ſo Poſitive in a *Negative:* p. 48.

Why does not he prove the *Affirmative*, when I challenge him to it? I will be bold to maintain the *Negative*, until he has prov'd the *Affirmative*, which I am ſure he can never do.

But one Mr. *Folly* (as he tells us) ſome while ago, ſince *Dead*, alledg'd this Corrupt reading at *Duckenfield* Hall, in diſcourſe with Mr. *Elliſon* Rector of *Aſhton under Line*. p. 48.

The Rector of *Bury* and his Brother of *Aſhton under Line*, are well adviſed in their Reports, the one tells a Story of a *Nameleſs Cameronian* in another Kingdom, the other Names his Perſon, but you muſt look for him in another World. They are reſolved to put us out of all Hopes of being ever able to Examine the Truth of their Tales.

He tells ſuch another Story (in which no Perſons are named) of ſome Gentleman in *Bolton*, who heard ſome Diſſenters in a diſpute about Religion, Cite *Acts* 6. as the *Cameronian* did, and appeal'd to the *Scotch Bibles*.

By this laſt Paſſage I ſuſpect this Story to have come out of the ſame *Mint* with the Former, for very few of the *Scotch* Bibles are miſ-printed, as we ſhall preſently make appear.

'Tis obſervable that neither Mr. *Elliſon*, nor the Gentleman at *Bolton*, do ſay, That theſe Diſſenters urged this Corrupt reading to prove the Peoples Power in making their own Miniſters, only that they read *ye* for *we*, which they might ignorantly do (finding it ſo in their Bibles) and not urge it as an Argument to ſupport an Error.

Perhaps they might refer to that Place, to prove the Peoples Power to chuſe their own *Miniſters* which is there aſſerted, without this Corrupt reading.

But ſuppoſe they miſ-applied this Falſe reading, it was their *Ignorance*, which no Man will juſtify.

" Ay, but doubtleſs they had been furniſhed with this Argument by ſome of " their *Leaders.* ——— p. 49.

He ought to prove that, before he affirm with ſuch aſſurance. If any of his Flock ſhou'd miſtake the Senſe of any Scripture, he wou'd think it hard to be charged with the Error.

Let him Name if he can, any of their *Leaders* that have ever recommended this Falſe reading to their *People*, and I do promiſe we ſhall renounce him as unworthy the Name of a Chriſtian, much more of a Miniſter.

But he hath had named unto him one of their *Leaders*, Mr. *R. Baldwin* (his Mr. *Calvin*), who detected and cenſured this *Corruption*, in an *Ordination* Sermon long before his *Rectorſhip*.

And there are ſome who well remember, that the Reverend Mr. *Philip Henry* many Years ago in his Expoſition of *Acts* 6. took notice of the Miſ-printing of *ye* for *we* in ſome Editions, and took Care to rectify it.

" 'Tis remarkable here, as he goes on, how the Diſſenters more eſpecially appeal-
" ed to the *Scotch* Bibles. I believe Mr. *Owen* will be *Wiſer* then to give a Cata-
" logue of the Corrupted Editions in *Scotland*, tho' he has in Part promiſed it. I
" ſhall be beholden to him, if he'l be pleaſed to Anſwer my Expectation herein. *p.* 49.

I am willing to oblige him, if poſſible, and to perform my Promiſe, I wrote to the Reverend Doctor *Rule*, Principal of the Colledge of *Edinburgh*, who ſent me this Account of the *Scotch Editions*; I ſhall give it in his own Words---- " It requir-
" ed ſome time to ſearch for our Impreſſions of the Bible. I find there was one in
" 1673. which is out of Print, I can find no Copy of it. One 1676. *Octavo*, which
" in *Acts* 6. 3. hath *we*. One 1678. *Quarto*, hath *we*. One 1691. *Octavo*, hath
" *we*. One 1694. *Twelves*, hath *we*. One 1694. *Twelves*, being *Cam*'s Bible
" hath *we*. One 1694. *Quarto*, hath *we*. One 1697. *Twelves*, hath *we*. One
" 1675. *Twelves* hath *ye*. One 1686. hath *ye*: This laſt was finiſhed in 1688.
" ſo that there were none printed here with that Corruption, ſave two (ſome ſpeak
" of a third, but I cou'd not find it) and both theſe under *Epiſcopacy*. Thus far the Doctor; I ſhall ſubjoyn the Vote of the *General Aſſembly*, which he was pleaſed alſo to Communicate.

At Edinburgh, January 15th 1698,

THE *General Aſſembly of this National Church* being informed that the *Presbyterians* (*and particularly* theſe *of Scotland*) *are charged in a Sermon preached by* Thomas Gipps *Rector of* Bury, *now printed and publiſhed, as Corrupters of the Word of God, with Deſign* to ſupport the Peoples Power in ſetting up Miniſters over themſelves; And that this Corruption is made by them *Acts* 6. 3. *by cauſing it to be Printed*, Whom ye may appoint over this Buſineſs, *inſtead of* whom We may appoint: *Therefore the General Aſſembly do unanimouſly declare, that as they allow no Power in the People, but only in Paſtors of the Church to Appoint and Ordain Church Officers, ſo they diſclaim the above mentioned Error of the Preſs, if any ſuch be found in any Bibles Printed in this Nation, And do declare they do not own any other Reading of that Text, to be according to the Original, but* whom We may appoint, *&c. Nor do they know nor can learn, that ever any in this Nation did publikly uſe or apply that Text to prove the Peoples Power in Ordaining their Miniſters.* Extracted by me,

J. Bannatyne *Cls. Syn. National.*

This Vote as Dr. *Rule* adds, " is a full and ſufficient Vindication of *Scotch*
" *Presbyterians* from the Aſperſion of Corrupting the Word of God, which the
" Author ye mention doth with no leſs *Ignorance* than *Falſhood* load us with. For,
" nor only do we abhor ſuch Practices, knowing that the Truth of God is not eſta-
" bliſhed by our Lie, But that Corruption of the Text ſhou'd deſtroy our Principle
" about the *Authoritative Miſſion* of Church Officers, ſo far 'tis from affirming it.
" The Story of the *Cameronian* Preacher may be look'd on as a meer Fiction: For
" tho' in our Aſſembly are Miniſters and Elders from all *Parts* of the *Nation*, none
" of them do ſay (tho' publickly and privately ſpoken to about it) that ever they
" *have heard* it.

I desire the Reader here to observe,

1*st*. That the *Cameronian* Story, with which the Rector has made such a Noise, is not so much as known in *Scotland*. It seems then to have been contrived in *England*, and perhaps at *Rochdale*, with design to furnish the Rector with proper Materials for his Corruption ---Sermon. It was Calculated for the Meridian of *Manchester*, tho' it might indifferently serve for any Part of *England*. The Episcopal *Dissenters* in *Scotland* have published abundance of extravagant Stories to reproach the Establishment there, but can any one imagine they wou'd overlook the Rectors Story, had there been the least Colour for it?

2*ly*. It falls out a little unluckily that the two *Scotch Editions*, that were mis-printed, happen'd under the Bishops there, and that when they were in full Power.

3*ly*. *Cann*'s *Scotch* Edition hath *we*, as the two *English* ones have, which I Noted in my *Remarks*. He was a rigid *Brownist*, but did not mis-print this Place. So much of the *Scotch Editions*.

II. I *Remark'd* that the *Dissenters* have written several *Commentaries* on the New Testament, and not one of them have attempted to confirm the Corrupt reading in *Acts* 6. 3.

This Observation which clears 'em from Designing to Corrupt that Place, our Author overlooks.

III. I argued, that had the Corruption been design'd in favour of the *Dissenters*, it wou'd have been promoted when they were *uppermost*.

But having examined most Editions between 1640, and 1684. I can find but three Corrupt Editions under the *Parliament*. And no less than thirty three under King *Charles* the II. a Table of which I have given in my *Remarks*. Most of the Corrupt Editions were in that Reign, when the *Episcopal Party* were *uppermost* and had the sole Management of the Press.

To this he saith, 1*st*. " the Dissenters need not when they were *uppermost*, for " 'they had gain'd their Point by the Sword. *p*. 49.

Was there ever a more impertinent Caviller? His Argument above was, they Corrupted the Word of God, because *Presbytery* was in the *Ascendent*, but now they are in the *Vertical*, he knows not whether they *wou'd Corrupt it or no*: That is when they had not the *Power* of the *Press* he suspects they Corrupted this Place, but when they had the Power of it, he allows they did not Corrupt it.

His next Answer is more absur'd, which is thus,

2*ly*. " Tho' most of the faulty Editions were set forth in King *Charles* II. Days, " when the Dissenters were undermost, yet they may be supposed to have promoted " the Corruption even then. p. 49.

To *Suppose* is one Thing, to *Prove* an other, one may suppose twenty ill Things of the Rector, as that he is unsound in his *Principles*, secretly Corrupt in his *Morals*, and a disguised *Adversary* to the *Government*, wou'd he like it, that some uncharitable Person should report this? And when he calls upon him to prove it, to come off with telling him, I did but suppose it? In this Manner he serves us, instead of proving, he supposes. He has forgotten the old Maxim of the Schools, *supponere non ponit esse*.

3*ly*. He adds, " the Bishops had not in King *Charles* II. Reign the Management " of the Press: It's in the Hands of *Patentees*, who cannot easily be controul'd in " their business. The Bishops have no Authority, so much as to Correct the Im- " pressions of the Bible.

I said, the *Bishops* and *Episcopal Party* (*p*. 15 and 17.) had the Management of the Press, and that he cannot deny. It's certain the *Bishops* had as much Power over the Press in King *Charles* II. time, as the *Presbyterians* had under the *Parliament*. For the State Printers have always Patents.

If the Biſhops have no Power to Correct the Impreſſions of the Bible, they may depute able Perſons to review 'em, and if they find them faulty, they may Complain to the King, to whom he ſaith the Printers are anſwerable, and get 'em puniſhed according to Law.

Let the Biſhops Power be what it will, it's nothing to the Argument in Hand, which is this, The Diſſenters can't be Charg'd with the Errors of the Preſs in King *Charles* II. time, becauſe the Epiſcopal Party were uppermoſt, and had the Management of the Preſs, with which the Diſſenters had nothing to do: Except it were in the publiſhing an *Octavo* Impreſſion of the *Britiſh Bible*, which was promoted by the Charity and Pains of that *great exemplar of Primitive Chriſtianity*, Mr. *Thomas Gouge*, and Corrected by Mr. *Stephen Hughes*, and Mr. *Charles Edwards*, two *Diſſenting Miniſters*: And this Impreſſion hath *we* in *Acts* 6. 3. It was Printed by *Bill*, *Barker*, &c. *London*, 1678. There's another large *Octavo* Impreſſion of the *Britiſh* Bible, Printed by *Bill* and *Newcomb*, *London*, 1690. and Corrected by Mr. *David Jones*, a *Diſſenting Miniſter*, this alſo hath *we* in *Acts* 6. 3. Theſe deſerve the more Conſideration, becauſe they are the only Impreſſions of the Bible (that I ever cou'd hear of) Corrected by *Diſſenting Miniſters*, and they might have been eaſily Corrupted without the Knowledge of the Printers (who are Strangers to the *Britiſh Language*) had the Diſſenters any deſign to falſify the Scriptures, as the Rector ſuppoſeth. Theſe two Impreſſions, Corrected by *Diſſenters*, are a ſufficient Vindication of them, from the Rector's calumnies.

Obſerve this Man's Candor, he ſuggeſts, that the *Biſhops* who were *uppermoſt* in King *Charles* II. time, could not *Controul* the King's Printers *to prevent Corruptions*, and yet inſinuates as if the *Diſſenters*, who were *undermoſt*, cou'd *Controul* 'em, *to make Corruptions* in the Bible.

4*ly*. " Let the Miniſter, ſaith he, give us an inſtance of any other miſtake in " Printing, whereupon depends any Controverſy in Religion, ſo frequently Com- " mitted in ſo many Preſſes, and in ſo many diſtant Places, *Cambridge*, *Oxford*, *Lon-* " *don*, *Edinburgh*, and it ſhall ſuffice. Who can believe an *Erratum* to be repeated " thus often by chance. *p.* 50.

1*ſt*. I gave a Reaſon already, why it's very poſſible an Error in one Edition of the Bible may be eaſily *propagated*, becauſe the Frames are often kept intire, which is not done, or very rarely in other Books. I gave this Reaſon in my Remarks, but he overlook'd it, and puts me to the trouble of repeating it.

2*ly*. I have prov'd that the frequent repetition of the Miſtake was when the Biſhops were in ſupreme Power, and the Preſs in the Hands of the Epiſcopal Party. They therefore muſt bear the blame of it, who ought to have given us more *Correct Editions*.

3*ly*. Since he puts me upon it, I will give him an inſtance of a Corruption, a thouſand times Worſe than a miſtake in Printing, whereupon a Controverſy in Religion depends, repeated in all the Editions of the *Common-Prayer*, I have yet met with.

The words are in the Office of *Commination*, *Curſed is the Man that maketh any carved or molten Image to worſhip it*. Theſe Words are ſaid, to be taken out of *Deut.* 27. 15. where they are thus, *Curſed be the Man that maketh any graven or molten Image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the Hands of the Crafts-Man, and putteth it in a ſecret Place.*----

In the *Liturgy* the words, *to worſhip it*, are added to the *Text*, which denounceth a *Curſe* upon ſuch as make an Image for any *Religious Ends*, as ſuppoſe to beget in us *good reflections*, to be a help to our *Devotions*, &c. but the *Addition* reſtraineth the Curſe to the Act or Intention of Adoration. Now there is a Controverſy of greater Conſequence than that of *ye* and *we*, depends upon this Addition, *viz*. *whether*

it

it be lawful to use Images (as suppose a *Crucifix*, &c.) *for Religious Ends, provided we don't worship them.*

The Papists say, it's not only lawful, but in some Cases necessary, that they are *Laymen's Books* and great helps to Devotion: The Protestants affirm according to the Scripture, they ought not to be made at all for the Ends of Religion, much less set up, either in the Congregation, or in a *Secret Place*. Deut. 27. 15. Isa. 44. 10. Habb. 2. 18, 19.

This Addition in the *Liturgy* seems to favour the *Popish Doctrine*, *that we may use Images in our Devotions, provided we don't worship them.*

I am the more Confirm'd in this by the *Images of Christ and his Apostles*, which I find Printed in several of our *Common-Prayers*, and I doubt not but they are intended as *helps to Devotion*, and I wish they were not designed as an Introduction to *Image Worship* in the late Reigns, when projects of that kind were conniv'd at.

However this be, the making of such Images is against the Scriptures, especially the 2*d*. Commandment, as is prov'd at large in the *Book of Homilies*. It's shew'd there.

1*st*. "That no Image of Christ can be made but a LYING IMAGE, be-
" cause he is God and Man: Nor can any true Image of his Body be made, because
" it is unknown now of what Form and Countenance he was; and there be in *Greece*
" and at *Rome*, and in other Places, divers Images of Christ, and none of them
" like to other, and yet every of them affirmeth, that theirs is the True, which
" cannot possibly be. Therefore as soon as an Image of Christ is made, by and by
" is a *LIE* made of him, which by God's Word is forbidden.

2*ly*. "If an Image of Christ cou'd truly be made, yet it is unlawful that it
" should be made, yea or that the Image of any Saint shou'd be made, especially
" to be set up in Temples. *Ireneus* reproves the Hereticks call'd *Gnosticks* for car-
" rying about the Image of Christ. In the same *Homily* is proved the unlawfull-
" ness of such Images from *Lev.* 26. *Exod*, 20. and *Deut.* 27. and they quote
" this *last Text aright*, without the *Addition* in the *Common-Prayer* *.

One may justly wonder, that such a publick Use of Images shou'd be allow'd in our Churches, and no Body that I hear of, reprove or condemn it, tho' all our *Episcopal Ministers* have subscribed to the *Book of Homilies*, as containing a *Godly and wholsome Doctrine*. The having of Images in our Books of publick *Devotions* is as unjustifiable as the setting 'em up in our publick Churches, nay the former is in this respect Worse than the latter, because in the latter Case, one Image serves a whole Congregation, but in the former there are as many Images as there are Worshippers with *Pictur'd Common-Prayer-Books* in their Hands.

Christians shou'd avoid all Occasions and Appearances of Idolatry, but the Rectors Zeal runs another Way. I will not tempt him to execute the fiery Sentence (he passed on the Bible) upon his Common-Prayer, but I will recommend to his Reading the learned and pious *Homilies against Idolatry*, which mention with Approbation, "*Epiphanius*'s renting a painted Cloth; wherein was a Picture of Christ,
" or of some Saint, affirming it to be against our Religion, that any such Image
" shou'd be had in the Temple or Church. If this Act of *Epiphanius* does not raise an Emulation in him to purge his Church of Images, he ought at least to declare against the *Corruption of Scripture* to which he is accessary, by giving *his Assent and Consent to all and every Thing* contain'd in the *Liturgy*.

Thus I have gratified his Request, and given him such an Instance as he desires, and yet I will not say, this is a Corruption of which all the *Episcopal Party* is Guilty, because I believe few of 'em have taken notice of it.

---

* *Serm. against Peril of Idolatry*, Part 3d.

For

For a farther Confirmation of his Charge againſt the Diſſenters, he ſaith, " out " of Arch-Biſhop *Laud*'s Speech that the *Puritans* expung'd part of the XX. Articles " of the Church of England, *concerning the Power of the Church to decree Rites and Ceremonies.*

'Tis yet *Sub-Judice*, whether that Clauſe was added by ſome of the *Biſhops* Friends, or expung'd by ſome of their Adverſaries, whether it were the one or t'other, it does not concern the Controverſy in Hand: Tho' it may ſeem more probable they were added by ſome *Ceremonious Gentleman*, for the *Puritans* alledged *that the Clauſe was not to be found in the* Latine, *or* Engliſh *Articles of* King *Edward* VI. *or Queen* Elizabeth, *ratified by Parliament.* The Arch-Biſhop can't ſay, that this Clauſe was in the Articles of King *Edward* VI. but comes off with this ſly Anſwer, *That the Articles made in the time of King* Edward VI. *were not now in Force, and therefore not Material whether that Clauſe be in or out* *.

I thought *Articles of Religion* were not like *Acts of Parliament*, to be repealed at pleaſure. However, one may conclude from Arch-Biſhop *Laud*'s Words, that the *Clauſe about Ceremonies* was not in the *Original Articles* of the *Reformed Church of England* in King *Edward* VI. time: If it had been in, he would have taken notice of it, as he does of all the Editions that had it in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time. *If it was to be found in the Records of Convocation*, Anno 1562. as the Arch-Biſhop ſaith, it is a ſign the Church of England was grown more *Ceremonious* than it had been in King *Edward* VI. time. Be this Matter as it will, it concerns not us, tho' the Rector according to his wonted Juſtice, reproaches us with it. *Remark* on *Remarks*, p. 51. 63.

† Arch-Biſhop *Uſher*, Arch-Biſhop *Williams*, Biſhop *Morton*, Biſhop *Holdſworth*, &c. in a Committee at *Weſtminſter*, 1641. mention this Article among the *Innovations* in Doctrine in the Church of England.

He has a pleaſant Digreſſion on theſe Words of mine, *no Diſſenters have urg'd this Corrupt reading in favour of a Popular Government in any of their Writings againſt Biſhops and Ceremonies.* Remark, p. 14. which he thus reports, " No Diſſenters " have urg'd this Corrupt reading againſt Biſhops and Ceremonies: *And then* " *adds*, who ever thought that *ye* had any thing to do with the Ceremonies? *p.* 52.

I ſpoke of the *Corrupt reading* as applied to a *popular Government*, which is evident by my Words. I Note this as an Inſtance of his Unfairneſs, and paſs by his Reflections.

I ſaid, That *he confidently Affirms, without Proof, that the* Scotch *Bibles are generally Faulty in this Paſſage*: " This is an *impudent Slander*, ſaith he, not to be Parallel'd " except, &c.

I ſee the Rector does not love *impudent Slanders*, when himſelf is the *Subject* of 'em; tho' he can be the *Author* of them to the prejudice of others. *Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri nè feceris.*

But I will make it appear that I have not Slander'd him. He owns, he ſaid, *he had juſt Reaſon to ſuſpect the* Scotch *Editions*, but takes no notice of his Saying in another Place, *that the* Kirk *tampers with and refines upon the Word of God*, Serm. p. 26. and in p. 25. he ſaith, the *Cameronian* Preacher bid the Congregation turn to their Bible, and they ſhou'd find in *Acts* 6. 3. *whom* ye *may appoint.*

Let any one judge whether all this does not amount to a *confident Affirmation that the* Scotch *Bibles are Faulty in this Paſſage.* A Man of Truth ſhou'd not Affirm what he is aſham'd to own.

He vindicates the motion he made in his *Sermon* to burn the Bible: " But why " burn the Holy Bible for one ſingle Corruption? Why? Becauſe an Error which " appears in Maſquerade, and under the Diſguiſe of Scripture being diſcover'd " deſerves no pity, being of ſo much the more dangerous Conſequence. *p.* 53.

---

* *Heyl.* Life of *Laud. p.* 339. † *Mr. Baxter*'s Life. *p.* 639.

This

This Man knows not how to distinguish between *Truth* and *Error*. May not an *Error* be condemn'd without sacrificing a whole Volume of *Divine Truths* to the Flames? It's true, an *Error* deserves *no pity*, but the *Bible* deserves our *veneration*. The Rector serves the *Bible* as he has done the *Dissenters*, condemns the *whole*, for *one* Error of the Press.

Unthinking Soul! He has condemn'd the Holy Bible to be burnt for one *single Corruption*, and in the same Discourse has endeavour'd to prove that there are *several Corruptions* in all our *Hebrew*, and consequently in all our *English Bibles* which are a *Translation* of the *Hebrew*.

He saith, two Thousand Years are lost in the *Chronology* of our *Hebrew* (and so of all our *English*) Bibles: He affirms that our Bibles are Corrupt in *Gen.* 11. 12. and in *Psal.* 96. 10. see his *Remarks* on *Remarks*. p. 24, 25, 26. which I shall examine in the *Postscript*.

Thus he has in effect condemn'd all our Bibles to the Fire. The very *Papists* leave the *Original Hebrew* and *Greek*, and their *vulgar Version* untouch'd, but the good *Rector* of *Bury* has condemn'd not only the *Hebrew*, which he says has many Corruptions, but the *Latin*, *Greek*, *English*, &c. Bibles which are all Corrupt in *Psal.* 96. 10. according to the Rector, so that he has condemn'd to be Burnt *all the Bibles in the Christian World*, which according to him have at least a *single Corruption*, and this is Cause enough why they shou'd be Burnt, as he wou'd have us believe.

He wou'd do well to tell the World *what Religion he is of*, for I think all *Christians* discover an *Affection* and *Tenderness* towards the Holy Bible, which in us he mis-interprets for an *Affection* to *Error*. The very *Jews* have a Veneration for the *Law* and *Prophets*, the *Mahometans* for their *Alcoran*, and so had the Ancient *Pagans* for their *Oracles* and *Sacred Annals*, which they carefully reposited in their Temples, but the Rector of *Bury*, the most *Reverend Rector* of *Bury* wou'd persuade his Superiours to *Burn* the *Holy Bible* for *one Corruption*, and at the same Time endeavours to prove that *all our Bibles* have several *Corruptions*. p. 53,

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Being an Answer to his Sixth Chapter, and containing a Vindication of Mr. Baxter *and others from the Rector's Calumnies.*

HIS last Chapter has nothing in it of Argument that concerns the main Subject, it consists of Invectives and unjust Reflections upon two worthy Persons, Mr. *B.* and Mr. *P.* that are gone to *rest*, and never that I heard of disturb'd *his*, when they were alive: Nor do my *Remarks* give him the least Occasion to bespatter the Memories of these *Good Men*, but they were *Dissenters*, which *is* Motive enough to the Pious *Rector* to embalm their Names with such Perfumes as his *Repository* produceth.

He begins with Mr. *B.* whom he had accused of *Corrupting the Word of God*, in leaving out the word *these* in *Acts* 15. 28.

I answered, *1st.* That Mr. *B.* does not pretend to Cite the Words of the *Decree* in *Acts* 15. 28. but gives the Reason on which it was grounded, had he cited the words of the Text, he wou'd have render'd 'em in the *second Person*, it seem'd good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon YOU no greater Burthen, but he speaks in the *third Person*, it seem'd good to the Holy Ghost and them, to lay upon them.

The Rector unfairly suppresses part of the Sentence by an, *&c. It seem'd good to the Holy Ghost and to us*, &c. and then cries out, *what a goodly Remarker* is this, to US in the *second Person*, as if I had mistaken one Person for another. But it is plain by my Words that I refer the *second Person* to the following Words *to lay upon YOU*, which he left out with, *&c.* that this unfair dealing might not appear.

He fills half a Page with a goodly declamation upon our Ignorance in the *English Accidence*, and wou'd *advise us to go to School again to learn the first Rudiments of all Languages.* p, 56.

I cou'd heartily wish his Defects were no worse than those he *untruly* charges upon us, but I fear he is yet to learn the *first Rudiments of all Religion, Sincerity and Honesty.* I wou'd remit him to the *Divinity School* to learn the IX. Commandment, *not to bear false Witness*, but that he is obstinately resolved *to burn* that *Book*, which only can teach him this Lesson.

However my Defence of Mr. *Baxter* stands good, that he designed not to Cite the very Words of the Text, but to refer to them. This the Rector could not deny, which is enough to justify him against his Charge.

2ly. If Mr. *Baxter* had mis-quoted Scripture, the *Rector* of all Men living should have held his Peace, for he is notoriously Guilty of this Fault, of which I gave *Ten* Instances in his Sermon, and he has not been able to deny one of them, only endeavours to excuse it as well as he can. He mis-quotes his very Text, *diminishes* and *adds* to his Quotations at his Pleasure.

He puts *instruction* for *admonition* in 1 *Cor.* 10. 11. leaves out the words, *which I command you*, in *Deut.* 4. 2. puts *cover* for *shall be full*, in *Isa.* 11. 9. reads *certify* for *testify*, in *Rev.* 22. 18, 19. leaves out, *till all be fulfilled*, in *Mat.* 5. 18. reads *seek out seven Men*, instead of *look ye out* among you *seven Men*, in *Acts* 6. 3. so that he has corrupted this very Scripture (by leaving out the Words, *among you*) concerning which he has made such a Clamour, as if the *Dissenters* had corrupted it.

There

There were *two* Things remarkable in his Sermon about Corrupting the Word of God; the *First* was his *Text*, from which he aggravated his Charge, and this he has miſ-quoted; the *Second* was the Subject of his Charge in *Acts* 6. 3. and this alſo he has *miſ-quoted*, by putting *ſeek* for *look*, and omitting the Words *among you*: And therefore it ill becomes him to aggravate Mr. *B*'s. omitting the word *theſe*.

3*ly*. I find *Acts* 15. 28. in the *Book of Homilies* (to which the Rector has ſubſcribed) quoted without the words *theſe*, "In the Acts of the Apoſtles we read that "they ſent word to the brethren, *Acts* 15. 28. that it ſeemed good to the Holy "Ghoſt and to them, to charge them with no more than *with neceſſary Things*. *

If the Omiſſion of the word *theſe* be a Corrupting of the Word of God, let him write an Invective againſt the *Homilies* of the Church, and retract his *Subſcripion* by which he has made himſelf a *Party* to this *Corruption*.

He charges Mr. *B*. with Corrupting a Paſſage in *Ferom* in his *Fifth Diſpute*, which I have not by me, and therefore can ſay nothing to it: But if it be miſ-quoted, I believe it was by Accident, and not by *Deſign* as he ſuggeſts. Its evident that he *deſignedly* miſrepreſented me, in ſaying I miſtook one Perſon for another, and to cover his *Deſign* ſuppreſſeth that Part of the Sentence to which I refer'd; and therefore have little Reaſon to believe his Accuſations of Mr. *B*. or any body elſe, and leſs Reaſon to believe he has ſuch an *Averſion* as he pretends, to that he unjuſtly Charges us with, viz. *a deſigned miſ-repreſentation of Authors*. This he is notoriouſly Guilty of, and which is a great deal worſe, *he hath Corrupted the Word of God*, which I admoniſhed him of in my Anſwer to his *Tentamen Novum*, in which you may find both Corruptions; one is in *Acts* 11. 19. where he reads, *the reſt preached the Word*, &c. inſtead of *they that were ſcatter'd abroad-- preached the Word*, &c. ſo our Bibles have it according to the Original. This looks like a *deſigned Corruption* meerly to ſupport his Argument, as the Reader may ſee in his *Tentam*. *p*. 4.

The other Corruption is of 1 *Cor*. 5. 4. *In the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt when ye are gathered together and my Spirit*, &c. ſo our Bibles. The Rector reads it, *In the Name of our Lord Jeſus---- and of my Spirit*, as if the Conſtruction were *in the Name of my Spirit*, i. e. by my Authority, intimating that the whole Power of Excommunication was in the Apoſtle, and none in the Church, contrary to 1 *Cor*. 5. 13, 14. ſee his *Tentam*. *p*. 17.

One wou'd think a Man that is Guilty of Corrupting the Scriptures ſhou'd not ſo ſeverely aggravate a miſ-quotation out of the Fathers, which may happen by the Fault of the *Tranſcriber* or *Printer*, or by the *inadvertency* of the moſt vigilant *Author*, without any Deſign. But none are more forward to cenſure a *Mote* in a Brothers Eye, than thoſe Gentlemen that have a *Beam* in their own. The Rector is one that doth ſo in his Charge againſt Mr. *B*. and my ſelf.

He beſtows the two next Pages upon a miſ-quoted Paſſage out of *Chryſoſtom*, in my *Plea*, in which μὴ is miſ-printed for μὰ. The Point I treated of was, that *Evangeliſts* were *unfixed Officers*, which is Evident in the New Teſtament, and is the General Opinion of learned Men, nay the Rector himſelf can't deny but they were at firſt *unfixed*. *Tentam*. *p*. 118. For the Confirmation of this receiv'd Opinion I quoted *Euſebius* and *Chryſoſtom* as agreeing with him, and by a miſtake μὰ is put for μὴ in the latter, which makes the *Negative* an *Affirmative*.

"I, but ſaith he, if you had cited *Chryſoſtom* in the Negative (as you ought) "he wou'd not have *agreed* with *Euſebius*. p. 57.

I have proved in my *Tutam*. *Evangel*. that they do agree, if *Chryſoſtom* be cited in the *Negative*, as I confeſs he ought. *Euſebius* ſaith, *they paſſed into other Countries and Nations*: *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, they did not go up and down every where (as the A-

* *Homil*. *againſt Whoredom*. I. Part, *p*. 72. *edit*. *Lond*. 1673. *Fol*.

postles did) but preach'd the Gospel as *Priscilla* and *Aquila*. He adds a little after, *that the Evangelists went about.*

* It's evident from *Chrysostom*, that *Evangelists went about*, but not *every where*: So did *Aquila* and *Priscilla* go up and down, but *not every where*, as St. *Paul* and other Apostles did. *Aquila* and *Priscilla* are *Evangelists* in *Chrysostom*, now it's certain they *went up and down*, and that as the Apostles *helpers in Christ*, Rom. 16. 3. *Aquila* was a Native of *Pontus*, *Acts* 18. 2. he lived with his Wife *Priscilla* sometime at *Rome*: Afterwards we find them at *Corinth*, *Acts* 18. 1, 2. afterwards at *Ephesus*, *Acts* 18. 18. 19. 1 *Cor.* 16. 19. and after that we meet them at *Rome*, *Rom.* 16. 3. if the Epistle to the *Romans* was written after the 1 *Corinthians*, as Doctor *Lightfoot* Affirms. † When the *second* Epistle to *Timothy* was written we find 'em in *Asia*. 2 *Tim.* 4. 19. 'Tis most undeniable then that *Aquila* and *Priscilla*, *Chrysostom*'s *Evangelists*, went up and down, and that *into other Countries and Nations* (tho' not every where) and so *Chrysostom* agrees with *Eusebius*.

But suppose *Chrysostom* shou'd not agree with *Eusebius* (as it's Evident he doth) this doth not prejudice *Eusebius*'s *Testimony*, nor my *Hypothesis* of *Evangelists*, that they were unfixed *Officers*, which the Rector himself is forced to acknowledge. I shall not quarrel with him about *Chrysostom*, whilst he owns my Notion of *Evangelists*, which if he think fit to retract, I will undertake to maintain without being obliged to *Chrysostom*.

" He thinks, I have no way to come off from his Charge of Corrupting *Chrysostom* (for which he is pleased to give me the Character of a *Great Rogue*) but by " pleading *Ignorance* or *Dishonesty*. p. 58.

There is no necessity of either *Plea*, which are both equally false: But I have a *Third*, which is a just one, and will pass with Men of *Honesty*, whose *Characteristic* is *Candor*, viz. that the mistake (of μὲν for μὴ) was by inadvertency or over-sight, as we will Charitably hope many of his are; tho' a Man must strain his Charity very hard to think so of his Corrupting the Text of Scripture. It cannot be imagined his Printer wou'd foist *whole Words* into a Text without the knowledge of the Author, especially where the *Corrupt reading* is adapted to an Argument which cannot be supported without it. Let the World judge who is the *Great R*---- he that happens to mistake a Sentence in the Fathers, or he that refines upon the Word of God.

Ay, but saith he, " the *Remarker* hath Corrupted *Rom.* 15. 19. for he affirms " *Tutam. Evangel.* p. 124, 125.) that *Paul* preach'd the Gospel in *Illyricum*: " Here is a gross and design'd Corruption of Scripture to serve a Cause. 'Tis in " the Original κύκλῳ μέχρι τῆ 'Ιλλυρικῆ, round about *unto Illyricum*, q. d. as far " as *Illyricum*, but not *in Illyricum*, as Mr. *Owen* aim'd to prove. *p.* 58, 59.

I perceive if a Man does not apply Scripture according to the Rectors mind, he can't escape the Censure of Corrupting it. I did not quote the very Words of the Text, but refer'd to it, as a Testimony of the Apostles, preaching in *Illyricum*, as several learned Men have done before me, who were never charg'd with Corrupting this Place. *Peter Martyr* explains *usq; ad*, by *usq; in Illyricum*, i. e. *into Illyricum*, so doth *Aretius*. * ἕως, ἄχρι and μέχρι are used promiscuously, and signify *usque ad*, as far as, or unto a Place, sometimes *exclusively* and often *inclusively*. Thus the Brethren conducted *Paul*, *Acts* 17. 15. ἕως Ἀθηνῶν, *unto Athens*, i. e. *into Athens*. So in *Acts* 20. 4. there accompanied him ἄχρι τῆς Ἀσίας, *as far as Asia*, or *into Asia*, as we well render it. And that must be the meaning, as appears by *v.* 5. *they tarried for us at Troas*. It's well if the Rector does not make the Translators of this

* Θεόντων καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένων. in Eph. 4. λόγ. 1. ά. † Vol. I. *p.* 299. *and* 313. * Vid. *Pet. Mart. and Aret. in loc.*

Place

Place Corrupters of the Word of God, for rendering ἄχρι (which is the ſame with μέχρι) by into.

I make no doubt but the Apoſtle preach'd the Goſpel in *Illyricum*, for he ſaith, that *from* Jeruſalem *and round about unto* Illyricum, *he fully preached the Goſpel of Chriſt.* If he preached at *Jeruſalem*, the *terminus à quo*, why not at *Illyricum*, the *terminus ad quem*, of his Apoſtolical motion? No Reaſon can be given why the end of his Progreſs ſhou'd be taken *excluſively*, when the *Jeruſalem*, the begining of it, is taken *incluſively*.

Suppoſe the Rector ſhou'd ſay, *he went from* Bury, *round about unto* Manchester; wou'd not any body underſtand him ſo, as if he had been in *Mancheſter*? Or ſuppoſe one ſhou'd ſay, *King* William *ſail'd from* England *round about unto* Holland, you muſt imagine according to the Rectors Senſe of the Words, that he touched only upon the Coaſts of *Holland*, but went not into *Holland*: In like manner, when the Apoſtle ſaith, he preached *from Jeruſalem unto Illyricum*, one wou'd naturally conclude he preach'd in *Illyricum*.

Titus, who was *Paul*'s Companion, and Meſſenger to the Churches he had planted, We are certain was in *Dalmatia*; which is part of *Illyricum*. * Therefore it's highly probable that *Paul* planted a Church there.

I find *Illyricum* mentioned by the *Magdebury Hiſtorians* † among the Places in which *Paul* had planted a Church, and they ground their Opinion upon *Rom.* 15. 19. *Ortelius* alſo mentions *Illyricum* as one of the Places where St. *Paul* had preached. ‖

In a Word, the Rector muſt prove that the Apoſtle turned back at the very Borders of *Illyricum*, before he can diſprove my Senſe of this Text, which is neither ſingular, nor inconſiſtent with other Scripture: And if he were able to do this (which he is not) it wou'd amount to no more, than my being miſtaken in the meaning of the Words, *unto Illyricum*.

As to his *Scurrilous Harangue* upon Mr. *Baxter* (for no other Reaſon but becauſe I called him *that Great Man*) I will not defile my Paper with it, but leave him to be chaſtiſed by the Scorpions in his own Breaſt, which will ſooner or latter find a tender Place in his awakened Conſcience. I will only take notice of the Character given Mr. *Baxter* by Dr. *Wilkins*, the Rectors late *Dioceſan*. *He cultivated*, ſaith he, *every Subject he handled, and if he had lived in the Primitive Times, he had been one of the* FATHERS *of the Church.* Another time he ſaid with admiration of him, *That it was enough for one Age to produce ſuch a Perſon as Mr.* Baxter. *

* *Ptol. Geogr. Tab.* IX, *Europ.* † *Eccl. Hiſt. Cent.* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. *p.* 22. ‖ *Diſcript. Peregrinat. D.* Pauli *Apoſt.* * Baxt. *Fun. Serm. by Dr.* Bates, *p.* 105. 106.

CHAP. VII.

Containing a Recapitulation *of some principal Things, with an* Idea *of the* Rector's *four Cardinal Vertues*, viz. *Justice*, *Truth*, *Candor*, *and Charity.*

I Shall sum up what has been largely insisted on, and give the Reader a short and clear View of the whole, by which he may judge what Credit is to be given to the Rector's Charge, and what Sort of Man he is.

I. I will begin with his IV. Arguments, which contain the Proof of his Charge. His *First* Argument (*that the first Error happened in* 1638. *when* Presbytery *was in the* Ascendant) he has (*1st.*) thrown out of doors himself, by acknowledging it a *meer Error of the Press*, and *an unhappy Mistake*. 2*ly*. I have proved that Presbytery in that Year was *undermost in England*, and *Episcopacy* in the *Vertical*. 3*ly*. And if it had been in the *Ascendant*, it will not follow that the *Presbyterians* were Authors of that Corruption, because, 1*st*. It does not favour their Principles. 2*ly*. Arch-Bishop *Laud* guarded the Press against the *Puritans*. 3*ly*. It was in the Hand of Episcopal Men. 4*ly*. The University of *Cambridge*, where the first Corruption happened, was under the Government of Episcopal Persons.

As to his II. Argument, That the *Corruption favours the Dissenters*, I have proved that it does not favour any Opinion of theirs; that they look on the VII. Deacons in *Acts* 6. as *Ministers of Tables*, and not of the Word and Sacraments; and that they ascribe the Power of *Ordaining* or *Appointing* Church-Officers unto the Ministers and not to the People.

In Answer to his III. Argument, *viz*. That *the Episcopal Party wou'd not Corrupt this Place, because it does not favour their Principles*; I have shewed, that it was Corrupted by them, and that several of 'em have asserted the *Popular Principles*, yet I will not be so uncharitable as to affirm, that they have Corrupted it on Design to advance these Principles: Tho' it were easy for a Man of the Rector's temper to aggravate the Matter.

I have sufficiently confuted the *Cameronian* Story, which makes his IV. Argument, and confronted the single Testimony of Coll. *Fairfax*, (which is against an *individuum vagum*, without naming Person, Time or Place) with the Vote of the *General Assembly* of *Scotland*: And have shewed how unjustly he has Traduced the *Scotch Editions* of the Bible, among which I can find but two that are Faulty, and those under the Bishops there; as it is undeniable the *English* Corrupt Editions happened when the Press was in the Hands of *Episcopal Persons*, who in Common Justice must Answer for the Errors of it.

These *Four Arguments* are the *Sandy-Foundation*, on which he builds so *heavy a Charge*: Now the Foundation failing him, the Superstructure falls on *his own Head*, and the *reputation* of this foolish Master-Builder lies buried under the ruins of his *Malicious Contrivement*.

II. Having shew'd the weakness of his Arguments, I will give you a Taste of his Regard to the Word of God. While he is charging us with Corrupting it, he has made the *boldest Attempt* perhaps of any Man living to undermine it.

He has endeavour'd to expunge all the *Titles of the Psalms* out of the *Sacred Canon*. He has affirm'd *Ps*. 72. 20. to be *manifestly False*. He disparages our *English Bibles*, which agree with the *Hebrew*, and wou'd persuade us that they are *Corrupted* by the

Jews

Jews in *material Things*, especially in *Psal.* 96. 10. and in *Gen.* 11. 12. He tells us that two Thousand Years are lost in our *Scripture-Chronology*, so that according to our *Hebrew* and *English* Bibles it cannot be prov'd that Christ is come in the Flesh. He stands convicted of having *Corrupted Acts* 11. 19. and 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. to serve a *Corrupt Design*. He saith that but for Tradition, *Plato*, *Seneca*, and the Seven *Wise Men of* Greece (and it's pity but he were made the Eighth) *might lay claim to Inspiration*, as well as the holy Scripture.

III. I will give an *Idea* of such Vertues as shine forth in his *Remarks* on *Remarks*, which render him a very *remarkable* Man.

I will shew him the Beauties of his own Face in the best Glass with which he has accommodated us, hoping that the charming Reflection of his own Form will not transport him into an *Adonic Passion*.

1*st*. His *Justice* is so transcendent, that it cannot be confined to that vulgar Rule of *suum Cuiq*; No, the Rector has given us a new Rule of *Justice*, which is *alienum Cuiq*; This is a *Tentamen Novum* in *Ethicks*.

He has given us an Instance of this *new Sort* of *Justice* in his *Cameronian* Story, which he imputes to the whole Body of Dissenters. I have read of One *Haman*, who sought to be reveng'd of *all the Jews* for One *Mordecai*'s Offence, but this cannot Parallel the Rector's *Justice* (which scorns to imitate such imperfect Patterns) for *Haman* cou'd prove *Master* of *Fact* upon *Mordecai*, which the Rector has not been able to do upon the *Cameronian* Preacher; and yet he has the *Modesty* to Vindicate this piece of *Justice* by telling us, *p.* 47. *The* English *Presbyterians are like to bear the Burthen of their Brethren in* Scotland.

2*ly*. His *Truth* is as remarkable as his *Justice*. He has advanced and attempted to Confirm a *False Accusation* against the Dissenters in General, especially the Presbyterians of *England* and *Scotland*, that they have Corrupted the Word of God: And yet wou'd have us believe that *his Sermon was preach'd in Vindication of the Church of* England *against* Lancashire *Dissenters*, who are not so much as named in the whole Sermon. You have another Instance of his *Truth*, where he says, *That, according to Mr.* Owen, *the People belike ordain'd the Deacons. Remarks on Remarks, p.* 4, 45.

This is a notorious Un-truth, which may be look'd upon as the Off-spring of his impregnated *Wrath*, and we may suppose he is the more fond of this *Spurious Brat*, because the *Sayings of Fathers* are a *Rule of Faith* to him, (we will suppose of *Practice* also) and he has quoted a very eminent Father, *who*, as the Rector saith, *cared not what in his Heat he said or wrote for the support of his own Opinion. p.* 29. 18.

The Story he tells of Mr. *P.* and Mr. *B.* are farther Evidences of his Regard to *Truth*.

3*ly*. His *Candor* and *Charity* are of a Piece with *Truth* and *Justice*, for all the *Vertues* meet in him.

1*st*. I will take Notice of his *Charity* to the *Dissenters* in General, concerning whom he is convinced, *that Meekness and Charity is due unto them*, and as a rare Instance of it, he wou'd have 'em styled, *the Foxes and Firebrands of the Church and Nation. p.* 2, 3.

He makes it *Religious Hypocrisy* in us to Style our Selves *Ministers of the Gospel*, which he and his Brethren seldom or never do, because, I presume, they reckon themselves dignified by more *honourable Titles. p.* 6.

He falsly says, *That the* Socinians *and almost all the Nation of* Schismaticks *and* Hereticks *are in the Interest of the Dissenters*. If *uncharitableness* be a *Characteristic* of *Schism*, I know no such *Schismatic* in the three Kingdoms as the Rector is: And if the Obstinate maintaining a *single Error in the Foundation* denominate a *Heretic*, what shall we call the Man, who has endeavour'd to over-throw the *whole Foundation* of Religi-

on

on by charging our Bibles with several *material Corruptions*, and condemning them to be *Burnt* for a *single One*? *p.* 28.

2*ly*. We will give some Instances of his *Charitable and Candid Temper* towards particular Persons, whom he abuseth without the least provocation.

He begins with *Ferom*, that *great Light of the Latin Church*, of whom he saith, *he is unworthy to be believ'd in any Thing, that he cared not what in his Heat he said or wrote*. In plain *English*, he makes a *Great R--gue* of him, and yet at the same time makes such another of Mr. *B*----*r*, *for reaping up the Faults of the Ancient Fathers*. I perceive Mr. *B*'s. Fault was that he intruded into the Rector's Province, whose proper Priviledge it is to *revile the Ancient Fathers*, tho' he denies not but Mr. *B*'s. *Reports* are True, but I have proved his Character of *Ferom* to be False. *p.* 18, 61.

In a Word, Mr. *B.* either did well or ill in *reaping up the Faults of the Fathers*; if *well*, why does the Rector with so much malignity *censure* him for it? If *ill*, who does he *imitate*, him? *p.* 18, 61.

He reflects on the Reverend Mr. *Tallents*, as if he wanted *Integrity*, tho' he can't disprove his Account of *Cambridge* in 1638, which Mr. *Fuller* justifies. Here the Rector makes *bold* to step into the Throne of the *Omniscient*, whose Prerogative it is to judge of Men's *integrity*, *Rom.* 14. 10, 11, 12. He knows who has done so before him, when he passed the same Censure on *upright Job*. chap. 1. v. 9. *p.* 39.

He reflects on his Majesties Words, * and hopes to Excuse it, by telling us, he *derided* only the *Scotch-Reason*, † tho' he knows the King had approv'd of it, and inserted it into his Letter of Instructions to his *Commissioner* in *Scotland*. This is an Instance of his *Loyalty*, for which his *Three Sermons of Subjection* have made him Famous in the *Northern-Climate*.

He reproaches the late Reverend Mr. *P.* as if *he had Married his Wife without Consent of Parents*, which I am inform'd is most False. Mr. *Robert Milne* of *Rochdale* affirms, " He often heard Mrs. *P*'s. Parents declare to his Father, who was a *Neigh-*" *bour* and *Relation* unto them, that they had not only given *free Consent*, but with-" all expressed a great deal of Satisfaction in the Marriage, and look'd on it as a " very gracious and merciful Providence. *p.* 60.

I am inform'd the *Class-Register*, a Copy of which the Rector saith is in his Hands, contains a Vindication of Mr. *P.* who being accused of an irregular and clandestine Marriage, produced a *Certificate* of the *Consent* of *Parents*. If this be so, The Rector is guilty of the basest disingenuity to revive a *malicious Accusation* against a Man in his Grave, and to suppress his *Compurgation*, whereby his Innocency was cleared. Mrs. *P.* affirms, and will take it upon her Oath, if there be occasion, that *she had her Parents* Consent, *and that Morning before she was Married to Mr.* P. *she had both Father and Mother's* blessing, *and in the Evening they were both* entertain'd *and welcomed by her* Parents.

He quarrels with an *innocent Passage* in the Reverend Mr. *O. H*'s. *Family Altar*, the design of which is to persuade Persons to keep up the *Worship of God* in their *Families*. It's well if the Rector in his *Parochial Visitations* be as forward to oblige his *Parishoners* to *Pray* in their *Families*, as he is to ridicule a judicious Discourse upon the Subject of *Family Prayer*. It puts me in Mind of the *Jews* Treatment of the Christians, of which *Just. Martyr* gives this Account, *tho' one shou'd speak* Ten Thousand Words *never so well, if he happens to say the* least Thing *that does not please you, because it's either not understood, or not carefully heeded, you overlook the abundance of Things that are well spoken, and get some little Word by the end, and fasten upon it the most impious Constructions.* ‖

---

* *Serm. p.* 25. † *Rem. p.* 41, 42. ‖ *Just. Mart. adv. Tryphon.*

The

The Rector serves Mr. *O. H.* much after the same Manner, he over-looks all the good Things in Mr. *H's.* excellent Book, the very Subject of which is recommending to every *Devout Christian*, and has pick'd out *one Sentence* in it to make *Sport* with, which is this, *God is the Author of all Topography and Geography, as well as Genealogy and Chronology. p.* 37.

Any one but the *Candid* Rector wou'd have over-look'd a Passage of this kind in a popular Discourse of *Practical Religion*, wherein Ministers Study not all the exactness of Expression. But he is One of *Just. Mart. Criticks*, who seeks Occasion to reproach more useful Men than himself. The words are capable of a fair Construction. Why may not God be call'd the *Author* of *Geography*, as *Hipparchus* call's *Homer*, *hujus peritiæ primarium Authorem* *, the first and Chief *Author* of *Geography*? Tho' *Homer* has not written professedly of that Subject, but there are a great many *Discriptions* of *Places* scatter'd up and down in his *Poems*, and so there are in the Scripture. The Great *Bochart* hath written a very Learned Book of *Sacred Geography*. †

It's certain the first Book extant that Treats of *Geography*, *Genealogy* and *Chronology* is the Bible, of which I hope the Rector will not deny God to be the *Author*.

FINIS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

WE find *ye* for *we*, in *Matt.* 20. 22. of a fair *Octavo* Bible, Printed at *Oxford* 1679. *ye are able*, instead of *we are able.*

THE POSTSCRIPT,

Being an Answer *to the Rector's* 2d. Chapter, *wherein he endeavours to prove the* Titles *of the* Psalms *to be no* Parts *of* Scripture, *and the* Hebrew Bibles *to have been Corrupted in very* material Things.

IN pursuance to my promise, I will now examine his Digression, about the *Titles*, or *Inscriptions* of the *Psalms*, and the *Purity* of the *Hebrew Text*, of which our *English Bibles* are a Translation.

I must here premise, that the Difference between the Rector and me about the *Hebrew Titles*, and *Copies* is no point of Controversy between the *Episcopal Party* and the *Dissenters*, but I oppose a bold Paradox of his, which he endeavours to maintain against the Common Sentiments of learned *Protestants*, and the more moderate *Papists*.

I shall begin with the *Titles of the Psalms*, which because he finds 'em omitted in the *Liturgy Translation* of the Psalms, he attempts to exclude out of the *Sacred Canon*. We agree that they are very Ancient, but he is of Opinion they are *humane Additions*, and that some of 'em are *False*: I affirm, and undertake to prove that they are of equal Authority with the rest of the Psalms, and to be admitted for *Canonical Scripture*. Before we enter upon the debate of this Point, let it be consider'd, 1*st*. That the Rector's Opinion is very singular, and has few or no Patrons in the Christian World at this Day. He has not hitherto been able to produce any one *Protestant* Writer, or *Christian Commentator* that has condemn'd 'em as Spurious and Un-canonical. A wise Man is not Ambitious of being thought singular, especially in a doubtful Point, least of all in an Error, and that of such a Nature as strikes at the Authority of any Part of the *inspired Volumns*. 2*dly*. Tho' the Titles of the Psalms, be but a small Part of Scripture, and several of 'em obscure, and hard to be understood, we must not therefore expunge them out of the Divine Canon, to which we must neither add nor diminish. Every Word of God ought to be equally precious to us, as being an Emanation from the same Fountain of un-erring Wisdom and Truth: Even the more abstruse, and seemingly less useful Parts of Scripture must be received with the same Veneration, which is paid to those that are more plain, and do more sensibly concern us. 3*dly*. If the Titles be Parts of the Holy Scripture, as I shall prove immediately, the Rector stands *convicted by his own Sermon* of being *a Corrupter of the Word of God*, for he endeavours to *diminish* from it.

In prosecuting this Subject, 1*st*. I will vindicate my Arguments to prove the Titles of the Psalms to be Canonical. 2*dly*. I will answer his Objections to the Contrary.

CHAP. I.

Vindicating my Arguments for the Titles *of the* Psalms.

THE Rector having challenged us to prove the Titles to be *Original and Essential Parts of Scripture*, I proposed a few Arguments for the Affirmative without Design of entering into this Controversy, as being foreign to his Charge: These he pretends to Answer, which I shall now Vindicate.

I. My first Argument was this, *That they are as Ancient as the Psalms themselves, for ought appears to the Contrary, they being in all the* Hebrew *and* Greek Copies *that ever I have seen, and that they are most of 'em Translated by the* LXX. *and by* Theodotion, Symmachus, *and* Aquila, *as also by the* Targumist.

* To this he answers, "That the Subscriptions of St. *Paul*'s *Epistles* are to be "found in all *Greek* Copies save that of *Claromont*, and are always Translated into "our modern Versions, and yet the Remarker will not own them for Canonical Scripture.

Nothing can be inferr'd from these Subscriptions in prejudice of my Argument, because, *1st.* They are not in all *Greek* Copies, as *Grotius* and *Beza* with many others have observ'd, and the Rector is forced to confess; but can he produce any Copy of the *Hebrew Psalms* that wants the *Titles?* The constant Consent of all *Hebrew* Copies bespeaks 'em not only ancient but original Parts of Scriptures.

2. The Postscripts of St. *Paul*'s Epistles are not the same in all ancient Manuscripts, and therefore saith *Grotius*, "they are of no Authority, because they are not in all "ancient Copies, nor the same in those that have 'em, and they are different in the "*Syriac* and *Arabic* Copies: † But the Titles of the Psalms are the same in all our *Hebrew* Copies, and so they were in those which *Jerom* used, which is an Argument they were not added, but are cover'd with the Text. When the Rector has produced the like Variety in the *Hebrew* Copies concerning the *Titles*, as is to be found in the *Greek* Manuscript concerning the *Subscriptions*, he does something to the Purpose, in the mean Time we'l dismiss his Argument as Impertinent.

II. My 2*d*. Argument was, *That the Titles of the Psalms were receiv'd by the* Jewish Church, *and are by the* Christian Church, *as Canonical Scripture; they are Translated by the* Jewish Doctors *into* Greek, *and by* Jerom *into* Latin, *and they are in the modern Versions.*

To this he Answer, "That the Subscriptions of St. *Paul*'s Epistles are Translated in the modern Languages, and all Christian Churches receive them yet not as "Canonical Scripture: So the *Jews* receiv'd the Titles, but not as Essential Parts "of Scripture, but as we do the Postscripts, and the Contents of the Chapters.

I. That the *Jewish* Church received 'em, but not as essential Parts of Scripture is barely affirm'd, and not prov'd. I challenge him to give us one Instance for the confirmation of so bold an Assertion. The *Jews* receiv'd the Titles and the Body of the Psalms alike, we do not find that they made any difference in Point of Authority between the one and the other, they that affirm they did, ought to prove it.

2*dly*. We reject the Contents of Chapters and the Postscripts of St. *Paul*'s Epistles from being Canonical, but he cannot prove the *Jews* did so by the Titles of the Psalms. They formerly received them as Parts of Scripture, and they do so still in our modern *Hebrew* Bibles, in which several of the Titles make the *first Verse* of the

---

* *Remarks upon Remarks, p.* 9. † *Nullius sunt Authoritatis, quia nec in omnibus exemplaribus apparent,* &c. Grot. ad fin. Ep. ad Rom. Vid. *Est. in loc.*

Psalms,

Pſalms, as they do in ſeveral modern Tranſlations. Vid. *Jun.* & *Temell. Piſcat Calvin.* &c.

3*dly*. It's true, the Poſtſcripts are Tranſlated in the modern Languages, but moſt Commentators wholly overlook 'em, or cenſure them as no Parts of Scripture: But both *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Commentators explain the Titles of the Pſalms, as they do other Scriptures, which is a clear Evidence they take 'em for Canonical.

I will confirm this 2*d*. Argument with another, which puts this Matter beyond all Contradiction.

If the *Jewiſh* Church, to whom were committed the Oracles of God, receiv'd the Titles of the Pſalms in the Apoſtles Time, they muſt needs be Canonical, for the Scripture, as receiv'd by them, is of Divine Inſpiration, as the Apoſtle declares, 2 *Tim*, 3. 16. But they were receiv'd by the *Jewiſh* Church in the Apoſtles Time, and long before, for they were in the Copy which the LXX. uſed, who tranſlated ſome, and tranſcribed others, that ſtill agree with ſeveral of thoſe in our *Hebrew* Bibles. They are to be found in the *Syriac Verſion* (I mean that out of the *Hebrew*) which is generally aſcribed to the Age in which the Apoſtles lived, tho' *Gabriel Sionita* refers it to *Solomon*'s Time.

And they are Tranſlated by *Theodotion*, *Symmachus* and *Aquila*, in the next Age after the Apoſtles. Therefore they were received in the *Jewiſh* Church in the Apoſtolical Age, and conſequently are of *Divine Inſpiration*.

III. I added, that ſome of the Titles are undeniably Canonical, as that of *Pſalm* 18*th*, mention'd in 2 Sam. 22. *To the Chief Muſician, a Pſalm of* David, *the Servant of the Lord, who ſpake unto the Lord the Words of this Song, in the day that the Lord deliver'd him from the Hand of all his Enemies, and from the Hand of* Saul.

" It does not follow, ſaith the Rector, that an inſpired Perſon affixed it unto the " 18 *Pſalm*, So that thoſe Words as placed before the 18 *Pſalm*, may in ſtrictneſs be " ſaid not to be Canonical there, tho' they be Canonical, 2 *Sam*. 22. p. 10.

What a miſerable ſhift is this poor Man put upon to avoid the Evidence of Truth? The Title of this *Pſalm* is *Canonical* and *not Canonical*, *Scripture* and *no Scripture*, *inſpired*, and *not inſpired*: It's *Canonical* with him in one Part of the Bible, it's a *humane Addition* in another. He does not pretend to give any Reaſon for ſo bold a Suggeſtion; only you muſt believe, *it is ſo becauſe it is ſo*. However, it is enough to my Purpoſe that he allows the Words of the Title to be Canonical in 2 *Sam*. 22. There you have the *Pſalm* and a *Canonical Title* prefix'd to it by his own Confeſſion. Hence it evidently follows, that ſome *Pſalms* have Canonical Titles: And if ſome be Canonical, the Titles of all the reſt muſt be ſo, for no Reaſon can be given, why ſome ſhou'd be Divine, and others Humane, ſince all are equally Ancient, and of the ſame date, for any thing can be made appear to the Contrary.

If the Words be Canonical in 2 *Sam*. 22, they are undeniable ſo in *Pſalm* 18. until the Rector can prove them added by an un-inſpired Perſon, which he'l never be able to do with all the help that *F. Simon*, or any of that Tribe can afford him.

IV. My 4*th* Argument was, That *other Titles muſt be prefixed by the Pen-Man, or by a Perſon Divinely inſpired, for they refer to Paſſages of Hiſtory not mention'd in the body of the* Pſalm. *I inſtanced in* Pſalm, 3. *and* 30. *and* 34. *and* 54. *and* 56. *and* 90.

To this he anſwers, " Tho' there be no particular and very obvious Expreſſions " relating to hiſtorical Paſſages, there are general Ones, which gave the Collectors " of the Book of *Pſalms* occaſion of affixing thoſe Titles to them. *p.* 10.

The general Expreſſions he talks of could never have directed 'em to ſuch particular Events as ſome Titles refer to. As for Inſtance, in *Pſalm* 3. No general Paſſages *there* can be applied more to *Abſalom* than to *Saul*, or others of *David*'s Enemies, but that the Title of the *Pſalm* directs us to refer them to *Abſalom*, when *David* fled before him.

The Title of the 30 *Pſalm*, is a Pſalm *or Song at the Dedication of the Houſe of David*. There is not one Paſſage in this *Pſalm* that the moſt obſerving Man cou'd have

have applied to this Occaſion, rather than any other joyful Event, if the Holy Ghoſt had not prefixed this Inſcription.

The like may be ſaid of *Pſalm* 34. which was Penn'd *when* David *chang'd his behaviour before* Abimelech, as the Title aſſures us, but there is nothing in the body of the *Pſalm* but what might be equally applied to other deliverances.

The ſame may be affirm'd of the other *Pſalms* I mention'd above, eſpecially of *Pſalm* 90. *A Prayer of Moſes the Man of God.*

" But ſaith the Rector, tho' *Moſes* and the *Iſraelites* be not mention'd in *Pſalm* 90. " yet many Verſes of that *Pſalm*, particularly the 9*th* and 10*th*, were thought to " allude to the Condition of the *Iſraelites* in the Wilderneſs, whole Stubbornneſs " God puniſhed by cutting their Lives ſhort, *i. e.* reducing 'em to Seventy or Eighty " Years.

True, it alludes to the Condition of the People in the Wilderneſs, but who wou'd have thought ſo, if the *Title* had not directed Interpreters to apply it to the State of *Iſrael* in the Wilderneſs? The Title occaſion'd this Application, and it was not the Application which occaſion'd the Title, as he without Reaſon imagines. Here, as in many other *Pſalms*, the Title is a Key that opens the deſign and meaning of the Holy Ghoſt in the body of the *Pſalm*, as we find well obſerv'd by the late Learned Arch-Biſhop *Sancroft*, in a Sermon upon a publick Occaſion on *Pſalm* 57. 1.

But ſaith our Author, " if the Titles refer to Paſſages of Hiſtory not mention'd " in the body of the *Pſalm*, this is a good Argument that they are not Canonical, but " the Conjectures of meer Men, which is the Reaſon (I ſuppoſe) why many *Pſalms* " have no Titles at all, and *many have none to any Purpoſe at all.* p. 11.

1*ſt*. Tho' the hiſtorical Paſſages be not mention'd in the body of the *Pſalm*, it is ſufficient they are mention'd in the Title, and that there is nothing in the *Pſalm* that is inconſiſtent with it, nay the whole ſweetly agrees therewith, and is better underſtood by the help of the Title, that leads us to the Scope and Occaſion of it, which otherwiſe wou'd be more obſcure, and not ſo intelligible.

2*dly*. Several *Pſalms* have no Titles at all, and that's an Argument they are not additional Conjectures, for the ſame Hands might have given *Conjectural Titles* to all, as well as to ſome *Pſalms*, at leaſt ſuch Titles as refer to the *Pen-Man*, or to the *Inſtruments of Muſick* on which they were ſung, &c. but ſuch *Pſalms* as the *Jews* found without Titles in their *Hebrew* Bibles, they left without, and they remain ſo to this day; a ſign the Titles are not Conjectures of Men, but the Dictates of the Holy Ghoſt. It had been an eaſy thing for bold Conjecturers to have added ſome ſort of Titles to ſuch as are without, and had the Wit of Man the ordering of the Matter, it wou'd have render'd 'em more uniform, and given 'em the ſame features, and wou'd not have beſtow'd Titles upon ſome, and left others without.

3*dly*. It wou'd have look'd more modeſt in the Rector to have ſaid, we underſtand not the Uſe of many Titles, than boldly, if not blaſphemouſly to affirm, *that many are to no Purpoſe at all.* There are many obſcure Paſſages in the Holy Scriptures which we underſtand not, are they therefore *to no Purpoſe at all?* Muſt they be expung'd out of the ſacred Oracles? It's well, if the Prophecies of *Ezechiel*, and *John the Divine* fall not under the Cenſure of this *Corrupting expunger*, for being abſtruſe and obſcure. It's no wonder that a Man who dares thus reproach the Spirit of God, the Author of the Titles of the *Pſalms*, ſhou'd make no Conſcience of reviling his Brethren. We know who ſaid, *to what Purpoſe is this waſte?* I doubt it is *to little Purpoſe*, to Reaſon with one who is not afraid to Charge the Spirit of God with *Impertinencies*. It will prove but a ſorry Excuſe to ſay he does not take the Titles of the *Pſalms* for Parts of Scripture, he aggravates his Sin by excluding 'em firſt out of the Canon, and when he has done by expoſing 'em to Scorn and Contempt. In like manner do the *Deiſts* treat other Parts of Holy Writ, which they think they may ſafely Ridicule, becauſe they don't believe 'em divinely inſpired.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Containing an Anſwer to his Objections againſt the Titles of the Pſalms.

HAVING vindicated my Arguments for the Titles, I ſhall now conſider the Rector's Objections againſt them.

1ſt. His firſt is this, " If ſome or any one Title may be *juſtly* queſtion'd, then this " renders all the reſt Suſpicious: and here he Queſtions the Titles of the 90 and 34 *Pſalms*, how *juſtly* we ſhall conſider preſently. *p.* 11.

But ſuppoſe one or two might be juſtly ſuſpected to be a Humane Additon, muſt all the reſt be ſo? The Rector thinks he may juſtly Queſtion ſome Things in the *Genealogies* and *Chronology* of the Old Teſtament of our *Engliſh Bibles*, does it follow therefore that all our *Scripture-Genealogies* and *Chronology* are ſuſpicious? It muſt be ſo according to the Rector's Logic: Thus by attempting to overthrow one Part of Scripture, he levels his Argument in effect againſt the whole. He tells us in p. 13. *That the Book of* Pſalms *has receiv'd ſome Humane Additions*, eſpecially *at the end of* Pſalm 72. Here he puts an Argument into the Mouth of an *Atheiſt*, that if ſome or any one Part of the Scripture may be juſtly queſtion'd (as ſuppoſe the Words at the end of *Pſalm* 72. which he ſaith are *manifeſtly Falſe*) then this renders all the reſt Suſpicious.

How wou'd the Rector Anſwer his own Argument? He muſt grant the Conſequence of the *Major* Propoſition, *That if ſome part may be juſtly queſtion'd, the whole is ſuſpicious*, for it is his own Argument againſt the Titles of the *Pſalms*. He argues (abſurdly enough) *à parte ad totum*. He cannot deny the *Minor*, for he affirms that ſome part of Scripture may be juſtly queſtion'd, as the Titles of *Pſalm* 90. and 34. and the laſt verſe of *Pſalm* 72. He muſt therefore either acknowledge the weakneſs of his Premiſſes, or deny the Concluſion, or yield unto an *Atheiſt*, *that all the Scriptures are ſuſpicious*. He can't deny the Concluſion, without expoſing the Reputation of a *Scholar*, nor can he yield it in conſiſtency with that of a *Chriſtian*: Therefore he muſt confeſs the weakneſs of his Argument, that *if one Title be queſtionable, all the reſt are ſuſpicious*.

The Rector here treats the *Pſalms* with the ſame Juſtice which he has given the Diſſenters; he condemns them all for the ſuppoſed Act of One (as in the Story of the *Cameronian*) and he condemns all the Titles for the ſake of one or two, which he thinks fit to Queſtion, as follows.

" The Title of the 90. *Pſalm* (A Prayer of *Moſes*, &c.) ſeems not to have been " Compoſed by *Moſes*, for the Age of Man in *v.* 10. is ſaid to be between Seven- " ty and Eighty Years, now the Life of Man in *Moſes*'s Time was much longer as " appears by the Age of *Job*, *Kohath*, *Amram*, *Aaron*, *Joſhua*, *Miriam*, *Moſes*, &c. p. 11, 12.

He is ſenſible of the weakneſs of his own Argument, and therefore adds.

" It muſt be Confeſs'd, That this Point is bandy'd by learned Men, and ſundry " Anſwers are offer'd to the *Arguments produced*, which I will not trouble the Reader " with.

It wou'd have been more honeſt in him, not to have troubled his Reader with this Argument (which he calls Arguments) *produced* out of *Pool's Synopſis*, where he cou'd not but find the *Anſwers of the Learned* *, which doubtleſs he wou'd have refuted if he had been able. Judge how fairly Mr. *G.* deals with the Scriptures, he

* Vid. *Pool. Synop. in Pſal.* 90. 10.

picks

picks up any trifling Objection againſt 'em, and takes no Notice of the Anſwers to it, which *he will not trouble his Reader with*. He is willing to *trouble* him with perplexing prejudices againſt the Word of God, but will not trouble him with ſuch Things as may Confirm his Faith.

I will in a few Words diſpatch this Objection.

1ſt. Dr. *Hamond* conceives that *Moſes* ſpeaks not of *the Age of Man as ſuch*, but of the ſhort Lives of the *Iſraelites* in the Wilderneſs, where all periſhed from twenty years Old and upward (except *Caleb* and *Joſhua*) ſome at Seventy, others at Eighty, which Year, it ſhou'd ſeem by the Words of *Moſes* (Pſalm 90. 10.) few exceeded in that State of Pilgrimage.

2dly. If *Moſes* ſpeaks of the *Age of Man*, as moſt Interpreters do think he doth, he muſt be underſtood of the *ordinary Meaſure* of Man's Life, which is between Seventy and Eighty. He muſt not be taken ſtrictly, but ὡσὶ τὸ πολὺ, that this is the ordinary Length of Man's Age, which not many exceed. The Rector has found Nine or Ten that lived beyond Eighty in *Moſes*'s Time, and I cou'd Name as many more ſince that Time that lived above Fourſcore Years. Hiſtorians report of *Johannes de Temporibus*, One of the Live-guard to *Charles the Great*, that he lived three hundr'd ſixty one Years *.

Parr † of *Aberbury* in *Shropſhire*, was about a hundr'd and fifty Years when he dyed, and but for Change of Air and Diet in his old Age, might have lived longer. I have heard it affirm'd by ſome that live near that Place, that he did Penance for a Baſtard Child in *Aberbury* Church, when he was a hundr'd and twenty Years Old. *Marſly Stent*, who liv'd within three Miles of *Oſweſtry*, was about a hundr'd and twenty Years Old when ſhe dy'd. Mr. *St. Nicholas*, a Miniſter not far from *Coventry* was near a hundr'd Years of Age, and I hear he preached within two Years of his Death. *Paul* the *Hermite* lived a hundr'd and thirteen Years, as *Jerom* || tells us. The *Ethiopians* generally liv'd a hundr'd and twenty Years, and ſome beyond, as *Herodotus* affirms §.

The Rector therefore may as well quarrel with the 90th *Pſalm* it ſelf that aſſerts Man's Age to be *Fourſcore Years*, as he doth with the Title of it, which applies this Meaſure to the *Iſraelites* in the Wilderneſs: For there is ſcarce a Countrey in which one may not find ſeveral Old People that live beyond Fourſcore.

He adds, " that ſeveral Authors in *Pool*'s *Synopſis* deliver their Opinion very cau-
" tiouſly, *veriſimile eſt Moſem hunc Pſalmum compoſuiſſe*, ſay they, 'Tis but likely then
" at moſt.

Theſe ſeveral Authors in *Pool*, to which the Rector refers, are but two, *Muis* and *Mollerus*, and theſe he miſ-repreſents, for thus they ſpeak, *Veriſimile eſt Moſen, occaſione ab cerumnis & miſeriis Iſraelitarum in deſerto ſumpta, hunc Pſalmum compoſuiſſe.* It is likely that *Moſes* compoſed this *Pſalm* upon the Occaſion of the Troubles and Diſtreſſes of *Iſrael* in the Wilderneſs.

Their *Veriſimile* refers to the Occaſion, not to the *Pen-Man* of the *Pſalm*, but our Candid Author leaves out the middle Words, as not to his purpoſe. Judge by this what Credit is to be given to his Quotations.

" *Gregory Nyſſen*, ſaith he, reckons this *Pſalm* among thoſe which had no Title ac-
" cording to the *Jews*.

If *Gregory Nyſſen* ſaith ſo, whom I have not by me, it's likely he ſpeaks of ſome of the *Greek* Tranſlations: ſure I am, the *Hebrew* Copies and the LXX. Verſion have the ſame Title with that in our *Engliſh* Bibles, and ſo they had in *Jerom*'s Time *, who flouriſhed about the ſame Time with *Gregory Nyſſen*. The *Targum*, *Syr.* and *Arabic* Verſions aſcribe it to *Moſes*.

---

* Vid. *Lampad. Mellif. Hiſt.* par. 3. p. 234. † *Fall. worth.* || *In vit. Paul. Erem.* § *Thal. lib. III.* * *Hierom. in Pſal.* 90.

Indeed

Indeed ſome who allow this Title to be Authentic, conceive that *David* is the Author, and that it is accomodated to *Moſes* and the State of the Church under him. *Theodoret* mentions ſome that were of that Opinion, *ſome* ſaith he, *do ſay, That great* David *wrote it, but that he adapted it to Divine* Moſes *.

That which led 'em to this Error was a prevailing Opinion that all the *Pſalms* were pen'd by *David*, which is certainly a great miſtake, 2 *Chron.* 29. 30. *Auſtin, Chryſoſtom, Bede*, and ſeveral *Jewiſh* Doctors were of this Opinion †.

Thus I have vindicated the Title of the 90*th Pſalm*, againſt the Rector's trifling Exceptions.

In the next Place he Queſtions the Title of the *Pſalm*, 34. *A* Pſalm *of David, when he changed his Behaviour before* Abimelech, *who drove him away, and he departed.* " The King of *Gath* here meant is call'd *Achiſh*, 1 *Sam.* 21. 10. and not *Abi-*
" *melech*, from whence the Truth of this Title may be doubted. We are told in-
" deed that *Abimelech* was a common Name of the Kings of the *Philiſtines*, as *Cæ-*
" *ſar* was of the *Roman Emperours*. But I am not ſatisfied with this. For I read but
" of one, at moſt two ſucceſſive *Philiſtine* Kings of that Name, *Gen.* 20. *and* 26.
" This was in *Abraham* and *Iſaac*'s days, but to fancy that the Name of *Abimelech*
" was continued among the *Philiſtine* Kings unto the days of *David* about eight hun-
" dred Years is not very likely, we meeting not with any one King ſo call'd in that
" Interval of Time, ſave one of the Kings of *Iſrael*, *Judg.* 9. 6. nor is the *Achiſh*
" King of *Gath* any where call'd *Abimelech*, except in this Title. That which might
" give Occaſion to this Miſtake, is the mention that is made of *Abimelech* the High
" Prieſt in 1 *Sam.* 21. whoſe Congreſs with *David* takes up the nine firſt Verſes of
" that Chapter. *p.* 12, 13.

To all this I anſwer,

1*ſt.* It was uſual in ancient Times for great Perſons to have two Names, ſo had *Shem*, who according to many, is called *Melchizedek* ‖. So had *Joſeph*, *Gen.* 41. 45. *Jethro* is call'd *Reuel*, *Exod.* 2. 18. and 3. 1. *Gideon, Jerubbaal, Judg.* 7. 1. *Eliakim* has a new Name upon his Advancement, 2 *Kin.* 23. 34. So had *Daniel* and his three Companions. It was uſual with Princes, eſpecially in the *Eaſtern* Countries to aſſume new Names, when they enter'd upon their Government, and they were call'd afterwards indifferently by either of both Names. Thus *Achiſh* ſeems to be the Name of the King of *Gath*, when a private Perſon, and *Abimelech* a Name he might aſſume upon his Advancement to the Throne, to conciliate the good Will of his Subjects, for *Abimelech* implies that a *King* ſhould be a *Father* to his People.

2*dly.* *Abimelech* ſeems to have been the common Name of the *Philiſtine* Kings (when they had any) as *Pharaoh* was of the Kings of *Egypt*, *Agag* of *Amalek*, *Num.* 24. 7. 1 *Sam.* 15. 8. *Darius* and *Artaxerxes* of the Kings of *Perſia*. This Opinion is very Ancient, how deſpicable ſoever it ſeems to the Rector, who finding it in ſome modern Commentators in *Pool*'s *Synopſis*, fancied they were the Authors of it. It's mention'd by *Baſil*, as the received Opinion of that Age, that the Kings of the *Philiſtines* were call'd by the common Name of *Abimelech*, tho' each of 'em had a proper Name by which he was call'd beſides: And this Account, ſaith he, we have ἐκ παραδόσεως, *by tradition* §.

3*dly.* But the Rector is not ſatisfied with this, becauſe he finds no one King of the *Philiſtines* ſo call'd from *Iſaac*'s days unto *David*'s Time, for about eight hundr'd Years. And good Reaſon for it, for he cannot find any King at all of the *Philiſtines* ſo much as mention'd in all that interval of Time. We read of the Lord's of the *Philiſtines* in *Samſon*'s Time, *Judg.* 16. 5, 30. and in the days of *Samuel*, 1 *Sam.* 5. 8. and 1 *Sam.* 6. 4. It ſhou'd ſeem their Government was *Ariſtocratical*, by the

* *Theodor. in Pſal.* 89. *Secund. Gr.* † Vid. *Hotting. Thes aur. Philolog.* lib. 2. Sect. 3. ‖ *Light.* Vol. 1. *p.* 12. § *Baſil. hom. in Pſal.* 33. *Gr. edit. Pariſ.* 1618.

Nobles, as far as we have any Account of it, for the Time he mentions: And then no wonder, he can find no King call'd *Abimelech* amongſt the *Philiſtines*. In *David*'s Time the ancient Government by Kings is revived, and therewith the Name of the ancient Kings, perhaps to render the new Government more familiar to the People. And it ſhou'd ſeem even in *David*'s Time, their Kings were little more than titular, 1 *Sam.* 29. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. But whether they had Kings or no between *Iſaac*'s and *David*'s Time is not material to the Point in Hand; it's enough that none are mention'd in the ſacred Hiſtory of one Name or another.

4*thly.* All that are acquainted with Hiſtory will own that *Pharaoh* was a common Name of the Kings of *Egypt*, and it is Evident from *Geneſis*, *Exodus*, i. e. two Books of *Kings*, &c. And yet we read of no King of *Egypt* ſo call'd from that *Pharaoh* which was drown'd in the Red Sea, unto another of the ſame Name in *Solomon*'s Time for the ſpace of above four hundr'd Years. Does it follow therefore that *Pharaoh* was not a common Name of the Kings of *Egypt*? No more will it follow that *Abimelech* was not the common Name of the Kings of the *Philiſtines*. Nothing can be infer'd from the ſilence of Scripture Hiſtory about the Continuance of theſe two Royal Names, for ſo long a tract of Time, for it is not the buſineſs of the *Inſpired Hiſtorians* to give us the Hiſtories of *Egypt* and *Paleſtine*, nor are they ſo much as mention'd but with ſome reſpect to the Church of God, whoſe Hiſtory they profeſſedly handled.

5*thly.* It is a very odd Conjecture of his, that *Abimelech* is inſerted for *Abimelech* mention'd in 1 *Sam.* 21. what an ignorant Fellow doth he make the Pen-Man of this Title to be, that he ſhould not only miſtake ך for ל which have no affinity either in form or ſound, in ſubſtituting *Abimelech* for *Ahimelech*, but, which is worſe, that he ſhou'd put *Abimelech* the High Prieſt of *Iſrael*, for *Achiſh* King of *Gath*, an uncircumciſed *Philiſtine*? The *Jews* were not ſuch Strangers to their own Hiſtory, or to that of the *Philiſtines*, their implacable Enemies, and near Neighbours, as to know no difference between a *Holy Prieſt* and a *Prophane Prince*.

But ſuppoſe ſome ignorant Hand had put *Ahimelech* for *Achiſh*, as he Fancies, can we imagine the *Jewiſh* Church, to whom were *Committed the Oracles of God*, to be ſo careleſs or perfidious as not to diſcover and rectify this Error? Could it poſſibly eſcape the *Maſorites*, who obſerves with the greateſt Exactneſs all the various Readings, and Anomalies of the Letters and Vowels? This is a new Diſcovery, the Honour of which is reſerv'd for our *Hypercritical Rector*, who may in good Time ſet up for a *Corrector* of the *Maſora*. Perhaps ſo inquiſitive a Man can tell us who Corrupted this Title, and it's well if the poor *Diſſenter* can eſcape his Cenſure, for here is *Abimelech*, a High Prieſt, expung'd, and alter'd into *Abimelech*; his profound Sagacity may diſcover a *Deſign againſt Epiſcopacy* in this Corruption alſo, for one of the Great Arguments for the *Epiſcopal Eminency* is taken from the *Levitical Prieſthood*.

6*thly.* Suppoſe I ſhou'd grant unto him that *Abimelech* is put for *Ahimelech*, this might be without any ſuch miſtake of *Abimelech* for *Achiſh* as he fancied, for *Abimelech* and *Ahimelech* are uſed of the ſame Perſon, 2 *Sam.* 8. 17. and 1 *Chron.* 18. 16. Dr. *Lightfoot* * conceives that this Title is Applicable to both the Stories in 1 *Sam.* 21. both to *David*'s diſſembling behaviour before *Ahimelech*, who is call'd *Abimelech* in 1 *Chron.* 18. 16. and to his changing his Behaviour before *Achiſh*, the *Philiſtines* King, for thoſe Kings were commonly call'd by the Name *Abimelech*, *Gen.* 20. and 26.

From the whole it appears, that his Cavils againſt the Title of the 34*th Pſalm*, are as groundleſs as thoſe againſt the 90*th Pſalm, and farther this Deponent ſaith not.* He does not pretend to except againſt any of the reſt, tho' he wou'd have all diſplaced out of the ſacred Canon.

Let's now review his Argument, " If ſome, or if any one Title may be juſtly Queſtion'd, then this renders all the reſt Suſpicious: To which I oppoſe this, *If*

* Vol. I. p. 57.

ſome,

ſome, or if any one Title be unjuſtly *Queſtion'd* (as he has done thoſe of the 34*th* and 9*th* *Pſalm*), *then his Suſpicions of all the reſt are* unjuſt. This Gentleman is a very *Suſpicious* Man, he not only *unjuſtly* queſtions one or two of the *Sacred Titles*, but takes occaſion to ſuſpect all the reſt. The *Diſſenters* may well bear the feeble Efforts of his *malignant Suſpicions*, ſince the *Divine Pen-Man* can't eſcape them.

2*dly*. His next Argument to prove the Titles a Human Addition is taken from thoſe " Words tack'd to *Pſalm* 72. 20. *the Prayers of David the Son of* Jeſſe *are en-* " *ded*, which is *manifeſtly Falſe*, if the Titles of the *Pſalms* be True, eſpecially that " of *Pſalm* 142. Beſides the *Pſalms* that follow the 72. are as truly Prayers as they " which go before it. Some body then, not inſpired, has either tranſpoſed the *Pſalm* " or elſe added to them the foreſaid Words, being either miſplaced or thruſt into " the Text. The like may have been done at the beginning of the *Pſalms* by prefix- " ing Titles to them *.

The Rector is one of thoſe who Affects to *Quarrel* with the Holy Scriptures, which he ſeems to read with Deſign *to ſeek Occaſion againſt them*. He endeavours to prove *Pſalm* 72. 20. to be *manifeſtly Falſe*, becauſe more Prayers of *David* are mention'd afterward. This is a very bold Challenge to the inſpired Writings. Wou'd you think this the Language of a Proteſtant Miniſter, or of a *Porphyrie*, a *Celſus*, or a *Julian*? To charge any part of the ſacred Scriptures with manifeſt *Falſhood* is to give the *Lye* to the *God of Truth*. Suppoſe we ſhou'd not be able to *reconcile* this Verſe to other Paſſages of the *Pſalms*, does it follow it is not *reconcilable*? It had been more modeſt in the Rector to have confeſs'd his own Ignorance, than to have charged the Holy Oracles with *Falſhood*. There are many ſeeming Contradictions in the Scripture, which learned Men have taken as much Pains to reconcile, as the Enemies of Truth have done to aggravate and expoſe, to the Reproach and Prejudice of Chriſtianity. I will imitate the former (as the Rector has done the latter) and Vindicate this Text from his ignorant or malicious Exceptions.

1*ſt*. It's generally thought that the *Pſalms* were collected into the Order we have 'em by *Ezra*, the Scribe, and an inſpired Prophet. This is affirm'd by *Hilary* † *Athanaſius* ‖ and *Jerom* §. And if ſo, it becomes us not to Quarrel with the Order of the *Pſalms* whoſoever the *Collector* was, they have been received by the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Church, as digeſted into the preſent Order.

2*dly*. The modern *Hebrew Copies* have this Verſe, ſo had the Copy which the LXX. Interpreters uſed, for it is Tranſlated by them, as it is by *Jerom*, which is an Evidence it was in the Ancient Copies. If the Rector cou'd have produced any one Copy in which this Verſe was wanting it might have given ſome colour to his Exceptions; but if Men may be allow'd to Charge the Divine Scripture with *manifeſt Falſhood*, where we find a perfect Harmony in the *Hebrew Copies*, Ancient and Modern, I tremble to think what an Advantage is given to the Enemies of *Chriſtianity*, which ſwarm among us, and ſeek all Occaſions to Reproach the Scriptures. The Rector has been ſo kind to 'em as to furniſh them with one Inſtance of a *manifeſt Falſhood* in them, for which Piece of Service, they can't but reckon themſelves highly obliged to him.

3*dly*. It is True, there is a ſeeming inconſiſtency between this Verſe, that affirms the *Prayers of David to be ended*, and the ſeveral Prayers in the following *Pſalms*, but it is to be obſerved, that the Ancient *Jews* divided the *Pſalms* into five Books, the 1*ſt*. Book ending at *Pſalm* 41, with *Amen, Amen*. The 2*d*. at 72, with *Amen, Amen*, and the Verſe which the Rector Queſtions. The 3*d* at *Pſalm* 89, with *Amen* and *Amen*. The 4*th* at 106, with *Amen, Halelujah*. The 5*th* at 150, with *Halelujah*. This diviſion is followed by the *Syriac*, and *Arabic* Tranſlators, as alſo by *R. David Kimbi*. It's mention'd by *Jerom*, *Auſtin*, and ſeveral others. If we allow this Diviſion of the *Pſalms*, which I find alſo in our *Hebrew* Bibles, the Senſe is clear,

* *Remarks on Remarks*, p. 13. † *Prolog. in Pſal.* ‖ *In Synopſ.* § *In ep. ad Sophron.*

the Prayers of David *are ended*, i. e. the Prayers contain'd in this *ſecond Book*, of which theſe Words are the Concluſion, and then follows ספר שלישי the *third Book of the Pſalms*, as it is in ſeveral of our *Hebrew* Copies.

4*thly*, The learned *Grotius* conceives that theſe words refer to the Collection of the *Pſalms* made by *David*. *Finitur hic Collectio Pſalmorum ab ipſo Davide facta*, &c. The Collection of *Pſalms* made by *David* (ſaith he) *ends here, thoſe that follow are added by* Aſaph, *and others, and liſt of all by* Ezra; *tho' there are amongſt theſe ſome that are compoſed by* David, *but after this Volume of Collections was finiſhed* *. Junius *and* Tremellius ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe. *The end of thoſe Prayers* (i. e. Pſalms *and* Hymns) *which* David *gathered together into* this Book, *and placed in this Order for the Uſe of the Church of God*, &c. †

5*thly*. We may read the Words thus, *the Prayers of* David *are fulfilled, or conſummated*. כלו is thus rendred in ſeveral Places. *Targ. Completæ ſunt Orationes Davidis filii Iſſai.* According to this reading the Senſe is plain and eaſy. The bleſſings of Chriſts Kingdom, of which this *Pſalm* treats, contain the Summ of *David*'s Prayers and Deſires, which are *Fulfilled* and *Conſummated* in the Glory of Chriſt's Kingdom.

This Senſe well agrees with the ſcope of this prophetical *Pſalm*, eſpecially with the foregoing Verſe, *Pſalm* 72. 19. *let the whole Earth be filled with his Glory, Amen, Amen.* Then it follows Verſe, 20. *The Prayers of* David *the Son of* Jeſſe *are ended, or fulfilled, q. d.* when this is accompliſhed, *I have my Prayers fulfilled and anſwer'd.* In this Senſe the *Hebrew Doctors* underſtood the Place, as *Muis* repreſents them. *When the Meſſias comes, and the Things prophecied in this* Pſalm *come to paſs, then ſhall the Prayers of* David *be fulfilled* ||.

This is ſufficient to Vindicate this Scripture from that *manifeſt Falſhood*, with which the Rector boldly Charges it. Both *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Expoſitors receive this Verſe with the ſame Veneration as they do the reſt of the *Pſalm*, and they Comment upon it, inſtead of expunging it out of the Canon. It's a new way of explaining Difficulties and reconciling ſeeming Contrarieties, to ſay the Text is *manifeſtly Falſe*. Let the World judge whether this Man be not a *Corrupter of the Word of God*, who wou'd expunge a whole Verſe out of our Bibles, for no other Reaſon but becauſe he either cou'd not reconcile it with other Scriptures, or was not willing to have it reconciled, that he might have a colourable Argument againſt the Titles of the *Pſalms*.

He allows in his Sermon (*p.* 2.) that we Corrupt the Word of God, when we Diminiſh from it: And tho' he maliciouſly Charges the whole Body of *Diſſenters* with Corrupting the Word of God, he has not been able to Name any one Perſon that has Corrupted it: But I can Name unto him a Perſon that has done ſo, and that is one Mr. *Thomas Gipps*, the Author of *Remarks upon Remarks*. The Perſon is well known in his Countrey, tho' I can't tell whether the Rector knows him or no: This Man I have taken ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ in the very Fact, Corrupting the Word of God by Diminiſhing from it not only the *Titles of the Pſalms*, but a whole Verſe, *e. g. Pſalm* 72. 20. He can't deny the Fact, for he has publiſhed it to the World under his Hand, he has no way by which he can hope to come off but by *juſtifying what he has done*, and for that he is furniſhed with as good a Stock of *Impudence* as moſt Men living, for he will not Bluſh to Affirm that ſome Things in the Bible are *manifeſtly Falſe*, when it ſerve to make his Notions *ſeemingly True*.

III. But I proceed to his 3*d* Argument againſt the Titles.

" There are Titles added to very many *Pſalms* in the LXX. Verſion, which are " not to be met with in the *Hebrew*, *e. g. Pſalm* 137. Ἱερεμίου *Jeremy* compoſed this

---

* *Grot. in loc. ex Pool. Synopſ.* † *Jun. & Trem. in Pſ.* 72. 20. || *Cum venerit Meſſias, & hæc contigerint quæ hoc carmine prædicuntur, enimvero tunc implebuntur Orationes ſeu Vota Davidis.* Muis in loc.

Song.

" Song. I aſk then, is this Title Divinely inſpired? and yet *Jerom* Tranſlates and " Comments upon it. *p.* 13.

I Anſwers,

1*ſt.* The LXX. Interpreters have added and diminiſhed in abundance of Places beſides the Titles of the *Pſalms*. It were eaſy to give hundr'ds of Inſtances of this kind. Nothing can be infer'd from hence but that the *Greek* Interpreters took too Great a Liberty of varying from the Original Text.

2*dly.* It is uncertain who compoſed the 137. *Pſalm*, nor is it material for us to know, while we are ſatisfied he was divinely inſpired. Some conceive it was pen'd by *David* prophetically, as *Iſajah* wrote of the Burning of the Temple, *Iſa.* 64. 11. So did *Aſaph* of the Deſtruction of the City and Temple, *Pſalm* 79. and 74. Dr. *Hamond* is inclined to think it might be pen'd after the return from the Captivity; and if ſo, it cou'd not be by *Jeremiah*, who was dead before.

3*dly.* The Addition of Ἱερεμί's was not in the Ancient Copies of the LXX, as *Hilary* aſſures us, for thus he ſpeaks, *It ſeem'd good to ſome to prefix the Names of* Jeremiah, Haggai *and* Zechariah *to the ſuperſcriptions of ſome* Pſalms, *but none of theſe are to be found in the Authentic Copies of the LXX. Verſion* *.

IV. His laſt Reaſon is, " The Oriental Verſions, the *Syr. Arab.* and *Chaldee Pa-* " *raphraſe* often wants Titles, frequently change 'em, and ſometimes add Titles, " where *Hebrew* and *Greek* have none, which cou'd never have happen'd, if they " had been Canonical Scripture.

The *Chaldee Paraphraſe* on the *Pentatuch* by *Onkelos*, and that on the *Prophets* by *Jonathan*, which are thought to be written about the Times of Chriſt, are not of that Authority as to bring the *Hebrew Copy* in queſtion, where they differ from it. I confeſs they have their Uſe, both for confirming the Purity of the *Hebrew* Text, as in *Gen.* 3. 15. and the Illuſtration of it, as in *Gen.* 4. 8. but eſpecially in Controverſies againſt the *Jews*, where they bear Teſtimony to the *Meſſiah*, as in *Gen.* 49. 10. *Iſa.* 45. 17, &c. but where they differ from the *Hebrew* (as they do in a great many Places) we ought to prefer the Fountain before the Streams. In the more obſcure Places they follow the LXX. Verſion, as *Munſter* obſerves †, and therefore can be of no greater Authority than the LXX. They are not without ſome *Jewiſh* Fables, as in *Num.* 21. 19. In ſome Places they depart from the Fountain of Truth, the *Hebrew* Text, as in *Num.* 23. 3. and in *Deut.* 4. 28. and 28. 64. where it is foretold that the *Iſraelites* ſhou'd *ſerve other Gods*, the *Chaldee Paraphraſe* tranſfers the Guilt of this upon the Heathen. A great deal of this Nature will occur to the obſervant Reader.

The *Targum*, or *Paraphraſe* on the *Hagiographa*, among which the *Jews* reckon'd the *Pſalms*, was made about the Year of Chriſt, 600, and is of leſs Authority than the two Former. This alſo varies from the *Hebrew* Text in multitudes of Places beſides the Titles of the *Pſalms*.

The *Syriac*, which is Ancient, tho' in many Places it follows the *Hebrew*, yet in others it differs from it, in ſeveral of which it follows the LXX.

The *Arabic* Verſion generally follows the *Syriac* ||, and therefore deſerves no particular conſideration.

So that this Argument of the Rector proves nothing in Prejudice of the Titles of the *Pſalms*, without affecting other Parts of Scripture, which are differently rendred in the *Oriental Verſions*. Thus our Author by attempting to deſtroy the Titles of *Pſalm*, has produced an Argument which equally depreciates the Authority of moſt, if not all the Books of the Old Teſtament, *Theodoret* Cenſures ſome who thought the *Inſcriptions* of the *Pſalms* to be Falſe, ἐπισὴ δὲ καὶ τὰς τῶν ψαλμῶν ὑποθέσεις τινὲς ἀπιγάλεσαν, &c. And adds, *To me it ſeems great Raſhneſs to alter the In-*

* ——*Horum nihil in authenticis* LXX. *Tranſlatorum Libris ita editum reperiatur.* Hil. in Pſalm. prol. † *Præfat in Jonam.* || *Prolegom. in Pol. Synop.*

ſcriptions,

ſcriptions, which were in being in the Time of Ptolomy, *who reigned in* Egypt *after* Alexander, *and were Tranſlated by the LXX. Elders into the* Greek *Tongue, as was the reſt of the Holy Scripture* *.

The Rector adds, " that there is not one Title in the *Hebrew* which is at all uſeful " to the unfolding any Myſteries relating to Jeſus Chriſt. p. 15.

This is confidently ſpoken after his Manner, but the Ancient Fathers were of another Mind. They apply the Title of the 22*d. Pſalm* to Jeſus Chriſt. *To the Chief Muſician upon* Aijeleth Shahar, *i. e. the Morning Hind*, ſo *Jerom* explains it, *Jeſus Chriſt*, ſaith he, *is the only Hind or Deer who deſtroys Serpents and takes away Poyſons, as is Evident by the Contexture of the whole Pſalm* †.

He is follow'd by the greateſt part of our modern Learned Commentators, The LXX. render it, *for the Morning Aſſumption*, and this, ſaith the ſame Learned Father, *ſignifies the Myſtery of the Reſurrection and Aſcention of Jeſus Chriſt unto the Father* ‖.

Theodoret alſo applies this Title to Jeſus Chriſt. Ἀντίληψις γὰρ ἐωσφὸρ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιφάνεια---- *The Morning Aſſumption is the appearance of our Saviour, who did ſhine as the Morning upon them that ſat in Darkneſs, for the Lord is the true Light* §.

They apply the Title of the 30*th Pſalm* (*a Pſalm---- at the Dedication of the Houſe of* David) to the Incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt.

Ἐγκαινισμὸν, &c. *The Dedication of the Houſe, the Renovation of the human Nature, which our Lord Chriſt perfected, when he dyed for us, and deſtroy'd Death, and gave us hope of a bleſſed Reſurrection* *.

To the ſame purpoſe ſpeaks *Baſil*, κατὰ δὲ τὸ νοητὸν, &c. *The Spiritual meaning ſignifies the Aſſuming of a Human Body by the Divine Word, and the Title refers to the Dedication of that Houſe which was built a new, and in a wonderful manner* †.

They apply εἰς τὸ τέλος, the *Greek* Title of ſeveral *Pſalms* (we render the *Hebrew Chief Muſician*) *to the Reſurrection and the End of the World* ‖.

Had the Rector been as converſant with Jeſus Chriſt, as the Ancient *Fathers* were, he might have found him even in the *Titles* of the *Pſalms*.

Others of them direct us to the Author, Occaſion, Intention and Uſe of the *Pſalm*, which greatly contribute to the right Underſtanding of it. Some others refer to the Meter and Inſtruments, on which they were to be Sung: Theſe the *Hebrew* Doctors confeſs their Ignorance of. But it does not follow, if ſome of them be unintelligible to us, that all ought to be expung'd out of the Canon. There are ſeveral other Things in the Holy Scripture hard to be underſtood, which muſt not therefore be rejected: And many of the Titles are eaſy and plain, and are therefore Tranſlated into *Engliſh*.

If the Titles are *Original* and *Eſſential* Parts of Scriptures, as I have clearly proved, the Rector is yet to Account, why they are left out of the *Liturgy-Pſalms*, and why a more imperfect Verſion of the *Pſalms* comes to be prefer'd to the more Correct, which came out in King *James* the I. his Time. The new Tranſlation which is in our *Engliſh* Bibles, and has the Titles, is never read in the Congregation; and the old imperfect Traſlation, which varies in ſeveral Places from it, and in ſome is contrary to it (as in *Pſalm* 105. 28.) is conſtantly uſed in our publick Aſſemblies. And it is more unaccountable yet, that we muſt give our *Aſſent* and *Conſent* to the unperfect Tranſlation, when we have a better in our Bibles: Theſe are Myſteries the Rector is perhaps better able to unfold, than he is the Myſteries concerning Jeſus Chriſt in the Titles of the *Pſalms*.

He aſk'd us in his Sermon, *why they are not done into* Engliſh? I anſwer'd, the Biſhops could beſt reſolve the Queſtion, whoſe Tranſlation we Uſe. The Rector is plea-

---

* *Theod. præfat. in Pſalm.* † *Sed nos cervum---- nullum alium niſi Chriſtum intelligimus, ſicus totius Pſalmi contextus oſtendit. Hieron. in Pſal.* Tom. VIII. ‖ *Hier.* ibid. § *Theod. in Pſal.* 22. * *Theod. in Pſal.* 29. Gr. † *Baſil. in loc.* ‖ Vid. *Baſil. hom. in Pſal.* 44. *and* 45. *and* 48.

ſed

ſed with this Conceſſion of Mind, and wiſhes the Diſſenters to take Notice, " That " the Scriptures being in the *Engliſh* Tongue is owing to the Biſhops Labours, Learning and Piety.

We think not the worſe of any good Thing, becauſe it comes to us through the Hands of the Biſhops, for whoſe Learning and Piety we have a juſt Eſteem: And yet as to this Point I muſt crave his Pardon for that ſlip of my Pen, in calling the preſent *Engliſh* Verſion, the *Biſhops Tranſlation*, for I don't find one Biſhop among the XLVII. Tranſlators nominated by King *James* the I. It's True, ſome were made Biſhops afterwards, and it's as True, that ſome others, as Mr. *Lively*, Dr. *Reynolds*, &c. Had no great Zeal for impoſed Ceremonies. Several of them were fellows of *Emanuel* in *Cambridge*, which the Rector ſaith, was a Nurſery of *Puritans*. In their Inſtructions they were to uſe *Tindals*, *Matthews*, the *Geneva*, &c. Tranſlations, when they agreed better with the Text than that which was call'd the Biſhop's Bible. * I wiſh the Rector do not quarrel with his Bible for having ſome Strokes of the *Geneva*, or *Presbyterian-Tranſlation*.

" But, ſaith he, the Diſſenters leave the Titles out of their *Pſalms* in Meter, " nor do they Sing 'em.

It's very True, nor were they deſign'd to be Sung, as all will Acknowledge, and it's Plain that ſome of 'em are Directions about the Manner of Singing, which the *Jews* themſelves are Ignorant of. But it does not follow that becauſe they are left out of the *Pſalms* in *Meter*, that they ought to be left out in the *Proſe* alſo? Many Paſſages of Scripture are improper to be Sung, muſt we not therefore read them? And I am apt to think the Reaſon why they were left out of the Liturgy-Pſalms was becauſe they were intended to be Sung, as they are ſtill in *Cathedrals*, and the *Rubrick* allows it in Pariſh Churches: Now ſince the *Pſalms* are *Read* and not *Sung* in our *Parochial Aſſemblies*, the Titles which are Part of Scripture, ought not to be expung'd out of the reading Pſalter. They can't be well Sung, nor were deſign'd for that End, and therefore are left out of the Singing Pſalms; but they may and ought to be read, as Part of the Word of God, and therefore ſhou'd not be left out of the reading Pſalms. But this is not the Controverſy between me and the Rector. The not reading of 'em is an *innocent Omiſſion*, but the Rector's *Attempt* of thruſting 'em out of the Holy Canon is vile and impious.

* *Full. Ch. hiſt.* lib. 10. Sect. 3.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Being a Vindication of Jerom, *and of the Purity of the* Hebrew *Text in* Pſalm 14. *with a ſhort Account of* Iſaac Voſſius, *whom the Rector follows in advancing the LXX. Verſion above the* Hebrew *Copies.*

THE Rector has two or three Pages in his Sermon to Vindicate the *three additional Verſes* in the Liturgy-Tranſlation of the *Pſalms*, in *Pſalm* 14. after Verſe the 3*d*, which run thus, *Their Throat is an open Sepulchre, with their Tongues have they deceiv'd*, &c. " Theſe he thinks are left out of the *Hebrew* Copies by the Care-" leſneſs of the Tranſcribers, rather than thruſt into the Greek by the Tranſlators; " and St. *Paul* in *Rom.* 3. has ſubjoyned 'em immediately to the 3*d*. Verſe of the 14*th*. *Pſalm*.

To this I anſwer'd out of *Jerom*, that *theſe additional Verſes were Tranſcribed out of the* Epiſtle to the Romans, *into the LXX, that they were not in the* Authentick Copies of the LXX, *and that none of the* Greek *Interpreters have Commented upon them.*

* The Rector here " proteſts againſt *Jerom*, as unfit to be a Witneſs in this " Caſe, and ſays, *he cared not what in his Heat he ſaid or wrote* for the Support of " his own Opinion.

1*ſt*. Why does he not *Proteſt* alſo againſt the *Greek Interpreters* for not Commenting on thoſe Verſes, or Produce ſome that have? If none of the *Greek* Interpreters before *Jerom*'s Time have Commented on them, as they did on the reſt of the *Pſalm*, it is a very clear Evidence that either they were not in their Copies of the LXX. or that they look'd upon them as an Addition to the *Pſalm*.

2*dly*. I doubt the Rector meaſures this Holy Man by himſelf. Indeed ſome have thought him too ſharp in his *Eriſtical Writings*, but the Rector perhaps is the firſt Man that ever queſtion'd his *Veracity* and *Honeſty*. A Man that in his Heat *cares not what he ſaith or writes*, is certainly a very ill Man. It may be the Rector had this *venerable Pattern* in his Eye when he publiſh'd his Sermon about Corrupting the Word of God. He owns himſelf *in a Heat*, Serm, p. 27. and then he was at Liberty *to ſay or write* what he pleaſed, in imitation of St. *Jerom*, to ſupport his own Opinion, or expoſe a Party.

But the miſchief on't is, he miſ-repreſents *Jerom* as much as he does the Diſſenters. All Men but the Rector will acknowledge *Jerom* to be one of the greateſt Lights of his Age. *Auſtin*, his Cotemporary, ſaith *his Divine Eloquence did ſhine as a Lamp from* Eaſt *to* Weſt † *Caſſian* calls him, *Catholicorum magiſtrum------ the Maſter of Orthodox Catholicks, whoſe Writings ſhine as Divine Lamps through the whole World.* ‖ *Sulpicius Severus* after the higheſt Encomium of him for the Merit of his *Faith*, his eminent *Virtues*, and incomparable Skill in the learned Languages, adds, *concivit odia perditorum* § *he ſtir'd up the hatred of ſome* wretched Fellows *againſt himſelf*: Hereticks *hated him* (ſaith he), *becauſe he conſtantly* oppoſed *them*, the Clergy *hated him*, *becauſe he Cenſures their* vicious Lives; *but all good Men* admire *and* love *him*.

It's evident the Rector neither *admires*, nor *loves* him, for what Reaſons he knows beſt, but by what follows, one wou'd be apt to think he *hates* him, for he odiouſly miſ-repreſents in theſe Words,

---

* *Rem. on Rom. p.* 18. † *Aug. cont. Julian.* I. 7. ‖ *Joh. Caſſian. cont Neſtor.* § *Dialog.* 1.

" *Jerom*

Jerome *arguing for the* Hebrew *againſt the* LXX, *becauſe forſooth, St.* Luke, (Acts 7.14.) *agreed not with the* Hebrew *Text but with the* LXX, *he gives that holy Evangeliſt this ſcurvy Character,* Lucæ qui ignotus & vilis & non magnæ fidei in nationibus ducebatur. *I'll not* Engliſh *the words, becauſe I will pay ſome deference to the* Preſbyterian *Father.*

And a little after he ſaith, *He is unworthy to be believed in any thing he affirms, upon this point in Controverſie, or indeed in any elſe.*

The tranſcribing of the whole Paſſage will ſet this matter in a true light, and convince the Reader how baſely the Rector abuſes *Jerome.*

His Words are theſe, *St.* Luke, *who is a Writer of that Hiſtory, and publiſhes the Book of the* Acts of the Apoſtles, *for the uſe of the Gentiles, ought not to write any thing that is inconſiſtent with that Scripture, which was already made publick to the Nations: For indeed the authority of the* LXX *Interpreters was for that time only in more repute than that of* Luke, *who was unknown, and of no account, and in no great eſtimation or credit among the Nations* †.

Is there any thing in theſe Words that reflects a *ſcurvy Character* upon the Holy Evangeliſt? All will own that the Lxx Verſion was known to the World before St. *Luke* was, and the Gentiles had no way to examine the truth of his Allegations out of the Old Teſtament, but by comparing 'em with their *Greek* Bibles. He was neither known nor eſteemed by the generality of the Gentiles, until his Writings made him ſo, which were the more eſteemed for their agreement with that Verſion of the Old Teſtament which they had among them. Dr. *Lightfoot* ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe with *Jerome. Whereas the New Teſtament was to be wrote in* Greek, *and come into the hands chiefly of the Gentiles, it was moſt agreeable, I may ſay,* moſt neceſſary *for them to follow the* Greek *Copies, as being what the Gentiles were only capable of conſulting.*

Jerome doth not ſay, that St. *Luke* was *vilis & non magnæ fidei,* but *ducebatur,* he was ſo accounted in the Nations, who at that time were ſtrangers to him, and had a greater Veneration for the Lxx than for his Writings. And if the Gentiles eſteemed him *ignotus & vilis,* it was no more than as the *Athenians* eſteem'd St. *Paul, Acts* 17. 18. The Rector may as well condemn St. *Luke* for ſaying that St. *Paul* was accounted a *Babbler* at *Athens,* as *Jerome* for affirming that St. *Luke* was accounted *ignotus & vilis in nationibus.*

Jerome cou'd not impoſe upon his Reader, when he affirm'd the additional Verſes in *Pſalm* 14. were not in the Lxx, for he appeals to the *Greek* Commentators, who all ſet a Mark upon them, and paſs them by *.

Nor has the Rector been able to produce one that hath Commented upon 'em. *Brugenſis* ſaith, They are not to be found in moſt of our *Greek* Copies, both *MS.* and Printed, *Vatican,* and others §.

---

† *Non enim debuit Sanctus* Lucas, *qui ipſius Hiſtoriæ ſcriptor eſt, in gentes actuum Apoſtolorum volumen emittens, contrarium aliquid ſcribere adverſus eam Scripturam quæ jam fuerat gentibus divulgata. Et ubique majoris Opinionis ille duntaxat tempore* Lxx *Interpretum habebatur auctoritas quam* Lucæ *qui ignotis & vilis, & non magnæ fidei in nationibus ducebatur.* Quæſt. ſeu Trad. Hebr. in Gen.

* *Denique omnes* Græciæ *Tractatores, qui nobis Eruditionis ſui in* Pſalmos Commentarios *reliquerunt, hos verſiculos* veru annotant, *atque* prætereunt, *liquido confitentes* in Hebræo non haberi, *nec eſſe in* Lxx *Inter.* Proæm. Hieron. in lib. 16. in Iſa.

§. *Non leguntur —— in pleriſque Græcis exemplaribus, tam impreſſis, tam manuſcriptis,* Vaticanis & *aliis.* Brug. in Pol. Synop. ad Pſ. 14.

Since the Rector excepts againſt *Ferome* as a Man *unworthy to be believed in any thing*, I will confirm his Teſtimony by another of *Origen*'s, who ſaith, the Apoſtle took theſe Verſes *ex variis Scripturæ locis* *, from ſeveral places of Scripture, by which words its evident, that they were not in the Lxx, nor in the *Hebrew* Text in the Fourteenth Pſalm in *Origen*'s time, who lived above an Age before *Ferome* was known in the World. And this Teſtimony is the more conſiderable, becauſe *Origen* had a genuine Copy of the Lxx, which he exhibited in his *Hexapla*, and underſtood the *Hebrew*, which very few of the Fathers did, beſides him and *Ferome*.

Grotius follows *Ferome* and *Origen*, and affirms, that St. *Paul* took theſe Verſes partly out of the *Pſalms*, partly out of *Iſaiah* †, and this is the received Opinion of the Learned,

But ſaith the Rector, Jerome *confeſſeth the Verſes are in vulgata Editione quæ Græce κοινὴ* dicitur, & in toto orbe diverſa eſt ; and adds. *I do not well underſtand him, but it ſeems the Copies then in ordinary uſe had the ſaid Verſes, though* Jerome's *had 'em not, if he is to be credited*, Remark on Remark, p. 18.

I will charitably relieve the Rector's ignorance, and help him to underſtand what *Ferome* means by his *verſio κοινὴ*, or *vulgar Verſion*. *It was a moſt corrupt Verſion of the* Lxx, *but the true Copy*, ſaith St. *Ferome*, *is to be found in* Origen's Hexapla, *and is faithfully tranſlated by me into the* Latine Tongue, *and is uſed at* Jeruſalem, *and in the* Eaſtern Churches, *and remains pure and incorrupt in the Books of the Learned* §.

This is the Verſion to which *Ferome* appeal'd, and of which he affirms, that it had not the interpolated Verſes in *Pſ.* 14. This *genuine Verſion* was publickly uſed in the *Eaſtern Churches*, and at *Jeruſalem*, which was but 35 Furlongs, or about 4 Miles ½ diſtant from *Bethlehem*, where *Ferome* lived (*Juſt. Mart. Apol.* 2.) and therefore any body might eaſily diſprove him, had he miſ-repreſented matter of Fact.

Now let any Man judge what an indecent thing it is in our Rector to blacken *Ferome*'s Memory with the Imputation of the moſt impudent and moſt fooliſh Lie, which Thouſands of that Age could have detected, and he wanted not Adverſaries that would have ſufficiently expoſed him upon ſuch an occaſion. His Friend *Rufinus* would have aggravated a Crime of this Nature, and made the World ſenſible of it long ago.

But whence is all this Spite at poor *Ferome?* The Rector is a Man that cannot ſuppreſs (tho' he endeavours it) the reaſons of his Reſentments. He calls *Ferome*, before he was aware, the *Presbyterian Father*. Theſe *Presbyterians* are a ſad ſort of People, the very mention of their Name puts the Rector into a *viſible Diſorder*, and raiſes ſuch a Commotion in his Spirits, as if he were haunted by a Legion of *Presbyterian Ghoſts*. His hatred to them is ſuch, that he cannot forbear *ſpitting his Venome* at every body that ſeems to favour their Principles.

This is Father *Ferome*'s fault, which the Rector cannot forgive him. He hath prov'd Biſhops and Presbyters were one and the ſame in the Apoſtles times, and that the difference between them was by *Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtom*, and not by *Divine Diſpoſition*.

---

* *Orig. Com. in epiſt. ad Rom.*

† *Utitur hic Paulus diverſis ſententiis, tum ex Pſalmis, tum ex Eſaia.* Grotius in Rom 3. 10. in Pol. Syn.

§ *κοινὴ Ipſa eſt quæ & Lxx, ſed hoc intereſt inter utramque quod κοινὴ pro locis & temporibus, & pro voluntate ſcriptorum corruptæ editio eſt.* Hieron. ad Sun. & Tretell. Tom. III.

* *Hier. Comment. in Ep. ad Tit.*

Its

Its well if St. *Peter*, St. *Paul* and St. *John* fall not under his diſpleaſure, as *Preſbyterian Fathers*, for *Jerome* brings his Proofs out of their Epiſtles. I preſume the Candid Reader will not believe the Rector when he charges the *Preſbyterians* with lying and abuſing Scripture, for *Jerome* himſelf, the *Preſbyterian Father*, can't eſcape his Cenſure.

He is very angry with me (*p.* 19.) *For endeavouring to make my Party believe he deſigned to depreſs the Authority of the Hebrew Copies. Surely, this Miniſter*, ſaith he, *never conſiders what he writes.*

It's well if the Rector conſiders *what he does*, in giving occaſion to this Charge, which I ſhall abundantly confirm. He ſaith in his Sermon, *p.* 9. *That it is more probable the three controverted Verſes might be left out of the* Hebrew *Copies, by the careleſneſs of the Tranſcribers, than thruſt into the* Greek *by Tranſlators.*

Here he evidently depreſſeth the Authority of the *Hebrew* Copies, and prefers the Lxx before them: Nay, By this Rule we muſt receive all the *Additions* of the Lxx (which are exceeding many) as Canonical, and ſuppoſe 'em left out of the *Hebrew* Copies by the careleſneſs of the Tranſcribers, *e. g.* they add a whole Pſalm at the end of the Pſalm about *David's Victory over Goliah*: They add a Verſe concerning the *Knifes of Stone* with which the *Iſraelites* were Circumciſed at *Gilgal*, that they were laid up in *Timnath-Serah*, and afterwards in *Joſhua*'s Grave, *Joſh.* 21. 42. and 24. 30. They add to *Exod.* 24. 10. Inſtead of *they ſaw the God of Iſrael*, they read, *they ſaw the place where God ſtood.* They add a whole Paragraph at the end of *Joſhua*, *Joſhua* 24. 33. They have a long Verſe in *Job* 1. 9. in which they repreſent *Job*'s Wife *ſcolding* at her Husband. They add to the end of *Job* 42. 17.

I cou'd inſtance in ſome Hundreds of *Additions* to, and *Variations* from the the *Hebrew* Text. Now all theſe muſt be admitted to the prejudice of the *Hebrew* Copy, and of our *Engliſh* Bibles (which have 'em not) according to the Rector's way of reaſoning.

The Rector obſtinately aſſerts the Authority of the Lxx, *which he is inclin'd to believe to be divine*; *vindicates* the *additional Verſes* in the fourteenth *Pſalm*, againſt the *Hebrew* Bibles that have them not; profeſſedly charges our *Hebrew* Text with ſeveral *Corruptions*, and thoſe *in things very material* (which I ſhall conſider preſently) and yet confidently tells us, *'twas never in his thoughts to depreſs the* Hebrew, *p.* 19.

Sure the Rector does not expect to be believ'd in what he ſays. If charging the Bible with *groſs Corruptions* be not a depreſſing of it, what is? He wou'd have *it burnt* for one Corruption, and yet the charging it with many Corruptions is no *depreſſion* to it. We will ſuppoſe the Rector at this time had an eye to the *Preſbyterian Father*, and *did not care what he ſaid or wrote.*

I told him, *If the* Lxx *be of as good Authority as the* Hebrew, *it's uncertain what becomes of the Rector's Text*, Prov. 30. 6. *for it is not in my Edition of the* Lxx. Cambr. 1665.

Here he *mightily triumphs* that he has found his Text in the Lxx, and (*p.* 20.) charges me with *lying*, and want of *ſincerity* and *honeſty.*

Theſe are words of Courſe with the Rector, and ſignifie no more than that he is a Man of *good breeding*, and has a *Sett of mannerly expreſſions*, with which he accommodates *his friends* upon all Occaſions.

It's true, the Text is in the Lxx, but not in its proper place. I look'd into the end of the *Proverbs*, where it ought to be, and not finding it there, concluded it was not in my *Septuagint Bible*. I have met with it ſince in *Prov.* 24. inſerted between the 22 and 23 verſes, with the addition of 13 or 14 verſes more of *Pro.* 30. The reſt of the Chapter, and the beginning of the 31*ſt* Chap. to verſe 10. I

cannot yet find. This Omiſſion and Diſlocation is an evidence that our Copies of the Lxx (which are of *divine Authority* to the Rector) are very imperfect, and may ground a Conjecture, that theſe Verſes were thruſt into that place by ſome ignorant hand, which has made bold with the Lxx in abundance of other places. I find them miſ-placed not only in the *Roman*, but alſo in the *Alexandrian* Copy.

Its being rightly placed in the *Complutenſian* and *Frankford* Editions which the Rector takes notice of (*p.* 20.) is no Argument that it was in the Ancient Copies of the Lxx, for the *Complutenſian Bibles*, are a new and mixt Verſion, partly from *Origen's Additions* out of *Theodotion*, *Aquila* and *Symmachus*, ||.

The *Frankford* and other *German Editors* have taken the liberty to change and tranſpoſe the Order of ſome Books, Chapters and Verſes that they might adapt them to the *Hebrew* Text, as Dr. *Walton* obſerves, †.

He ſuggeſts that *Iſaac Voſſius has abundantly prov'd the* Hebrew *Copy corrupted, and that with much Learning and Judgment.*

I know not how the Rector comes to eſpouſe the Notions of *Iſaac Voſſius*, who unworthily diſparages our *Hebrew Bibles*, not only contrary to the Sentiments of his Learned and more Judicious Father *Gerhard Voſſius*, but to the received Opinion of moſt *Proteſtant* Writers, who have with great Learning and Judgment aſſerted the Purity of the *Hebrew* Text againſt the *Papiſts*.

Lindanus, *P. Galatinus*, *Canus*, *Jacobus Chriſtopolitanus*, *Gord. Huntlæus*, and many more of the *Popiſh* Doctors, have endeavoured to enervate the Purity of the *Hebrew Text*, in favour of the *Latine Verſion*, which the *Papiſts* prefer above the *Original*.

Among our ſelves, *Iſaac Voſſius*, and a few more (among whom the Rector ſeems ambitious to make ſome little Figure) have deſerted the *Proteſtant Doctrine*, and conſpired with the *Romaniſts* to expoſe the *Hebrew Text*, as *impious* and *corrupt*; for what reaſons and ends they know beſt.

It will not be much for the Rector's Reputation to lick up *Voſſius's* Spittle, whoſe Judgment bore no proportion to his great reading, as may appear by the following Paſſages, which I ſhall tranſcribe out of him.

That Book, ſaith he, of the Hebrew Bible, *is dumb, which no man is able to read or underſtand, becauſe one half of it is maimed; neither has it any Vowels, but what were given it by the enemies of Chriſtianity* *.

In another place he paſſes this arrogant Cenſure on the Learned Tranſlators of the Hebrew Bible.

I could produce whole Chapters, *eſpecially out of the more obſcure Books of the Holy Scripture*, *as* Eccleſiaſtes, Job, Hoſhea, *and others, in which you will not find ſo much as* one Verſe *rightly underſtood, and rendred by the Interpreters of our Age* ||.

If no Man be able to read or underſtand the *Hebrew Bible*, how comes *Voſſius* to underſtand it? And if he does not underſtand it, how knows he that the *Interpreters of our Age* have not Tranſlated aright? If he does underſtand it, why had he not given us a right Tranſlation of thoſe *whole Chapters* that are miſrendred?

He repeats his bold Aſſertion, *The Hebrew Book is mute, as being deſtitute of true Vowels, and tho' we had Vowels, even this would not enable us to Tranſlate it, ſince we have utterly loſt the ſignification of the words, and the ſenſe which ariſes from them; even the* Jews *themſelves do not deny this difficulty of interpreting.* Reſp. ad Obj. p. 325.

|| *Walt. Prolegom. ad Polygl.* ix. 28. † *Ibid.* 29.

* *Codex ille mutus eſt, quem nec legere, nè dum intelligere, quiſquam ſciat.* If. Voſ. Reſp. ad Nup. Crit.

|| *In quibus nè unicus quidem occurrat verſiculus, qui à noſtri ſæculi Interpretibus rectè acceptus & redditus fuerit.* De Sibyll. Orac. cap. 13. p. 270.

If

If our *Hebrew* Bibles be ſuch uſeleſs Things as *Iſ. Voſſius* makes them, it's hard to determine what they are good for: It's well if his admirer Mr. *G.* does not condemn them to the Flames (as he has done ſome of our * *Engliſh* Bibles) for the Corruption he finds in them, and their being unintelligible at the beſt, if we may believe his Friend *Voſſius*, for whoſe *profound Judgment* he has ſo great a Veneration.

The ſame *Voſſius* thus reflects on Dr. *Lightfoot's Horæ Hebraicæ & Talmudicæ*, on 1 *Cor.* which the learned World juſtly admires. *He ſeems to me*, ſaith he, *to be leſs faulty who wou'd expound the Goſpels out of the* Alcoran *than out of the* Talmud. And a little after he Charges him (as juſtly as the Rector does the Diſſenters with Corrupting the Word of God) with *preferring the Authority of the* Talmud *to that of the* Goſpel *in the Explication of Scripture* †.

He commends *Charles* the Great *for laying aſide the* Gothick, Saxon *and* French *Languages, and for propagating with his Empire the* Latin *Tongue, and aſſigning it the chief Place*, ‖ *non in Sacris modo, not only in Religious but in Civil Actions alſo.*

He calls thoſe that defend the *Hebrew* Bibles *Aſſellos caſſos lumine & intellectu*, Aſſes void of Judgment and Underſtanding, *girt with a* Profeſſors *Gown, and carrying for their* Shield *the* Maſoretick *Bible with all it's* Points §.

Thus much I thought fit to Advertiſe the Reader concerning *Iſaac Voſſius*, whoſe *great Judgment* the Rector applauds, and ſubſcribes to in his Oppoſition to the *Hebrew* Bible.

He that makes our *Hebrew* Bibles to conſiſt in *dumb Letters*, which no Man can read, much leſs underſtand, that Cenſures the Interpreters of his Age as not rendering ſo much as one Verſe aright in whole Chapters, that ſpeaks favourably of the Uſe of the *Latin Tongue* in *Religious Worſhip*, is not the moſt excellent Pattern for a Proteſtant Miniſter to follow; but the Rector is of Age to chuſe his own *Maſters*.

* *Serm. p.* 27. † *Voſs. Reſp. ad Obj. p.* 331. 332. ‖ *Ibid. p.* 340. § *Epiſt. ad Andr. Colv.*

CHAP. IV.

Being a Vindication of my Arguments for the Purity of the Hebrew *Text.*

I Briefly hinted at two or three Arguments for the Purity of the *Hebrew* Copies, which I will now improve and vindicate from the Rector's Exceptions.

I. I affirm'd the *Hebrew* Copies to have been incorrupt in our Saviour's Time, becauſe he *never Charg'd the* Jews *with Corrupting the Scriptures.*

The Rector takes no Notice of this Argument, but he ſaith afterwards (*p.* 22.) "many Corruptions *might ſteal* into the *Hebrew* Text, and *deſignedly be thruſt* into it "before Chriſts Time.

He dare not ſay, there were any thruſt into it, but he ſlily inſinuates there *might be*: He deals here with the ſacred Text, as he has done with Diſſenters, he brings it *under Suſpicion*, when he wants direct Proof.

If the *Jews* before the Birth of Chriſt had deſignedly Corrupted the Holy Bible, doubtleſs we ſhou'd have heard of it in the Hiſtory of the New Teſtament. We are told there that the *Oracles of God were Committed to them*, Rom. 3. 2. They were made the *Conſervators* of the Divine Writings, which were concredited to them.

Had

Had they betray'd so great a Trust, and perfidiously falsified the Holy Scriptures, can we imagine that Christ and his Apostles wou'd have overlook'd so horrid a wickedness, attended with a train of the most fatal Consequences? Jesus Christ was faithful to him that appointed him, as also *Moses* was in all his House: *Moses* as a Servant, but Christ as a Son over his own House. *Moses* his Fidelity consisted in his Care to transmit the Divine Laws pure and incorrupt to the People as he received them in the Mount: Had these Laws been Corrupted by the wickedness of after Ages, doubtless the Lord Jesus wou'd have restored 'em to their Original Purity. It cannot be conceiv'd that the Son shou'd be less concern'd for the Laws of his House than the Servant had been. One great end of his Appearance was to Reform the *Corruptions* of the *Jewish* Church, and wou'd he leave their very Laws *Unreform'd*? He came into the World *to bear Witness unto the Truth*, and can we think he wou'd have overlook'd the *Falsehoods* of that Book which is the *Standard of Truth*, had any been *thrust into it*, as the Rector supposes? He who reproves the *Jews* for lesser Sins, wou'd never have Connived at so great an Abomination, as the Corrupting of the *Hebrew Copies*.

He censures their *Corrupt Glosses* upon the Law, and Vindicates it from them. *Mat.* 5. much more wou'd he have noted the *Corruptions* of the Original Text.

He bids his Disciples *search the Scriptures*, *hear the Scribes and Pharisees sitting in the Seat of* Moses, *who was read in the* Synagogues *every Sabbath day*. It's not likely that he wou'd have recommended the Study of *corrupted and depraved Scriptures* unto his Followers without a *necessary Caution* against the Errors of them.

From the whole it's Evident that the Scripture of the Old Testament was not Corrupted before the Birth of Christ, nor were they Corrupted after, as appears by the Testimonies which Christ and his Apostles cite out of 'em, which are all for Substance to be found in *Moses* and the *Prophets*, as they are cited by them.

Thus *Origen* and *Jerom* anciently argued for the Purity of the *Hebrew* Text, " If the *Jews* Corrupted the Scriptures (say they), they " did it either before or since " the coming of Christ: Not before, because Christ and his Apostles do not Charge " 'em with it; not after, because the Allegations made by Christ and his Apostles out " of the Old Testament are all, or most of 'em still to be found there *.

II. I urged the Testimony of *Philo*, who flourished about the XLth. Year of Christ: He writes that even unto his Time for the space of above 2000 Years, not *one Word* had been Chang'd in the Writings of *Moses*.

To this the Rector answers, " that ῥῆμα, which I render'd *Word*, sometimes sig- " nifies *Sentence*, or an *entire Proposition*. 'Twas the Laws of *Moses* the *Jews* were " careful of, and not the Words, Syllables or Letters, according to *Philo* in this " Place.

Ῥῆμα is usually render'd *Word* by all Interpreters, and that's the Primary and most proper Signification of it, and any one wou'd so render it here that has no design to expose the Scripture, and does not study to elude such plain Testimonies as assert it's Purity. He grants that the *Jews*, according to *Philo*, changed not any *Sentence* of the Law: But who knows not that the change of one Word, yea of one Letter (as in the instance of *ye* and *we*) often alters a whole Sentence? If Words might be chang'd, whole Sentences might as easily be perverted. *Philo* argues *a minore ad majus*, that the Ancient *Jews* were so far from changing the *Law of Moses*, μη ῥῆμα γε αὐτὸς μόνον τῶν ἀπ' αὐτῆς γεγραμμένων κινῆσαι--- *that they removed*, or changed *not one Word of what he had written*.

The Rector prevaricates when he saith, *'twas the Law of* Moses *they were careful of, and not the Words*: Doubtless they were careful of both, and *Philo* saith, they

* *Orig. lib.* 8. *in Isa. ut refert Hieron. in Cap.* 6. *Isa.*

changed

changed not ῥῆμα μόνον, *not one Word*, with what confidence then dare the Rector affirm *they were not careful of the Words*? He confesses *they were careful of the Laws*, he wou'd do well to tell us how the Laws cou'd be preserv'd without the Words.

" It does not follow hence saith he, that there was no Alteration in any Word or " Point; this might happen (*tho' the* Jews *did it not wilfully*) for any thing *Philo* " offers to the contrary. *p.* 21.

Truth is constant to it self, but the Rectors notions are inconsistent: He told us above *that many Corruptions might be designedly thrust into the Text before Christ's Time*, and now he saith, *the* Jews *alter'd not a Word wilfully*. This he delivers as his own Sense in a *Parenthesis*, and not as *Philo's*.

It's evident the Rector strains the Signification of ῥῆμα to elude the Force of *Philo's* Testimony for the Purity of the *Hebrew* Text. It's true it signifies a *Sentence* sometimes, but we ought not to recede from the primary and literal Signification of Words without necessity.

The *Jews* were careful not only of the Sentences, but *were Religious to Superstition in counting the very Letters of the Bible to preserve it intire*, as the Rector told us in his *Sermon*, p. 13. but now he is inclined to think they took no Care of the *Words*, *Syllables* or *Letters*, but only of the Sentences of the Law, as he explains *Philo*.

I leave it to such as can to reconcile the Rector to himself.

Certain it is, that the *Jews* had of Old, and still have, such a Zeal for their Law, that the very *Words*, *Syllables* and *Letters* were preserved by them with no less Care than the *Sentences* of the Law.

We have a memorable Story in *Jerome*, which whether True or False shews what a Zeal the *Jews* of that Age had for the Words and Letters of the Law. The Story is this. *Joab* slew his Master, because he did the Work of the Lord deceitfully, when he read *Deut.* 25. 19. *Thou shalt blot out* זָכָר עֲמָלֵק *the* Male *of* Amalek, when he ought to have read זֵכֶר *the Memory of* Amalek. * The Letters of זכר are the same in both readings, all the difference lies in the Points or Vowels.

The *Jewish Rabbies* say, *that he who makes the least Alteration in the Bible commits the inexpiable Sin*: And they add, *that if any One out of Ignorance, or Malice shou'd change* One Word *therein, the whole World wou'd be in danger of Perishing, and returning into it's primitive Chaos*: And they give this Reason for their Opinion (which they endeavour various ways to confirm) *that the World was Created for the Sake of the Holy Scripture*: *If any one therefore shou'd Corrupt the Scripture, the World must needs Perish* †.

This Confirms *Philo's* Testimony, and explains the meaning of his ῥῆμα μόνον, which the Rector has weakly endeavour'd to perplex: But I shall have Occasion presently to speak more of their Care of the very *Words*, and *Letters* of the Law, agreeable to this Testimony of *Philo*.

III. I argued from the *Masora*, which I affirm'd to have been an effectual means to preserve the Purity of the *Hebrew* Text, and renders it impossible that any Corruption shou'd have crept into them.

All that the Rector hath to say to this Argument is, " That 'twas no hard mat- " ter for cunning *Rabbies* to alter Words and Letters, and still to keep the just " Number of them, as *ye* and *we* in *Acts.* 6. 3. where still remains the same Num- " ber of Words and Letters.

The Rector discovers himself to be a perfect Stranger to the *Masora*, which tells us not how many *Words* and *Letters* are in every Book, but the Genuine *Writing* and *Reading*, where any diversity Occurs, as also when Words are written *Fully* with

* *Hieron. in Isa.* 6. † *Polan. Syntag. ex Talm.* lib. 1. cap. 37. p. 211.

quiescent

quiescent Letters, especially ו and י, and when *defectively* without them: They note when a Word *begins*, *ends*, or is to be found in the *Middle* of a Verse: They observe all the *peculiar Constructions* of it, with the *Ambiguous Significations*; they remark also the *Vowels* and *Accents*: They take notice of the *greater* and *lesser* Letters, and of those that are *inverted* and *symbolically* Pointed; nay they have enter'd down how often every Letter of the Alphabet is contain'd in the whole Scripture. All this and much more the learned Reader may find in *Buxtorf*'s *Tiberias* or *Commentary upon the Masora*, by which it's Evident the *Hebrew* Copies could not be Corrupted after the *Masora* was Written. This is acknowledged both by *Jews* and *Christians* that understand the *Masora*.

Elias Levita, a learned *Jew*, who tho' he differs from his own Countrey Men about the Time of the *Masora* (which he thinks was invented at *Tiberias* after the Year 500.) yet he owns it in concurrence with other *Rabbies* to be an *effectual Conservatory* of the Purity of the Law. I will give you his own Words. * *After this Work which the Authors of the* Masora *perform'd, it is impossible that any Change or Corruption shou'd happen to any of our Bibles; hence it is that our* Rabbins *of blessed Memory have not said in vain, that the* Masora is the hedge of the Law.

The same is affirm'd by Christian Writers, vid. *Buxtorf. Tiberiad. Capnion. ser Reuchlin. in speculo Oculari. Ariam Montan.* in præfat. Bibl. *Brixian.* in Arca Noe. *Nich. Fuller.* Miscellan. III. 13.

His Instance of *ye* and *we* in *Acts* 6. 3. is very Impertinent, for if the Letters *w* and *y* were reckon'd up in the *Acts*, the false reading *ye* wou'd make a *y* supernumerary and lessen the Number of *w's*.

Even those that plead against the Purity of the *Hebrew* Text, will readily acknowledge it was not Corrupted since the Invention of the *Masora*, and therefore have no way to avoid this Argument but by affirming (with *Elias Levita*) that the *Masora* is a late Invention of the *Jews* at *Tiberias*, about the Year 500; and that the Scripture was Corrupted either before or by those *Jews* who drew up the *Masoretick* Notes and invented the Vowels. This way the Popish Doctors and *Vossius* go. But the Rector deserting his learned Friends, ignorantly affirms the *Masora* cou'd not preserve the Bibles in Purity. He is willing to believe they are Corrupted, and that no Art or Care of Man (no not the admirable Invention of the *Masora*) could possibly prevent it.

However, he is so kind to us, as to tell us, " That he does not affirm, that the " *Hebrew* was Corrupted in any material Thing till after the destruction of *Je-* " *rusalem*. p. 22.

He shou'd have informed us, what *immaterial Corruptions* were got into the Bible before the destruction of *Jerusalem*, and what *material Ones* after.

" Nevertheless, adds he, it might have been Corrupted before the *Fifth Century*, " when the *Masora* is said to be invented. *Rem.* ibid.

Here he seems to allow that the Bible has not been Corrupted (at least in any Thing that is *Material*) after the penning of the *Masora* in the *Fourth Century*. He wou'd or shou'd have said the *Sixth Century*, for the *Masora*, according to *Elias Levita* was Pen'd after the Year 500. † But the Rector who affects to contradict himself, acknowledgeth in another Place (*Serm. p.* 13.) that the *Masora* was before the Birth of Christ, *for* (saith he) *the* Jews *were Religious to Superstition, as may be thought, counting the very Letters of the Bible to preserve it intire: Hereunto our Lord alludes, in* Matt. 5. 18.

Our Author is so variable, that one knows not where to find him.

---

* *Elias Lev. in Buxt. Tiber.* p. 6. † *Buxt Comment. Masoret. p.* 12.

One

One while the *Masora* was before the Birth of Christ (*i. e.* Since *Ezra*'s Time) another while it was invented in the *Fifth Century*. In one Humour he wou'd have us believe the *Jews* were *Religious to Superstition*, to preserve the Bible intire; in another Humour, they *designedly Corrupted* it; in another Mood, *they alter'd not a Word willfully*. The Rector shou'd blame no Body for differing from him, since he can't agree with himself.

Convenient nulli qui secum dissidet ipse.

He gravely " concludes, 'tis but lately since the Christians receiv'd the *Hebrew* " Bible from the modern *Jews*, who may very well be suspected to have made bold " with it in prejudice to the Christian Religion. *p.* 22.

Had the Christians no *Hebrew* Bibles till of late Years? Were there not *Hebrew* Bibles in the Hands of the Ancient *Jews*, who many of 'em became Christians? The Apostles were *Jews*, I hope he'l not say they had no *Hebrew* Bibles, or that they receiv'd them of the *modern Jews*.

But perhaps he means the present Copies of the *Hebrew* Bible, and that these are come from the modern *Jews*. This is boldly affirm'd, and if we call upon him to prove it, he must have recourse to *F. Simons* help, who tho' he has endeavour'd to weaken the Authority of our *Hebrew* Bibles, yet is forced to Confess the Antiquity of the Copy that goes under *R. Hillel*'s Name, which the *Jews* affirm to be Written by *R. Hillel* himself, some Years before the Birth of Christ. So doth *Cunæus de Repub. Hebr.* and *Schickard de jure Reg. Hebr.* who are quoted by *F. Simon*, but he himself thinks it was Written by some *Jewish Rabbi* of that Name since the Invention of the *Hebrew* Points by the Doctors of the School of *Tiberias*, because he finds it Pointed and Accented. So that according to his Confession it may be above 1000. Years Old: And if the *Hebrew* Vowels be Co-equal with the Letters (as I think the Judicious and Learned *Buxtrof* hath effectually prov'd) the *Hillelian* Copy, with which our modern Copies agree, may be as Old as the *Jews* affirm, and written by the Ancient and Famous *Hillel*, who flourished about 60. Years before the Birth of Christ.

Doubtless there are many Ancient Copies of the *Hebrew* Bible in several *Christian Libraries*, for which we are not obliged to the modern *Jews*.

I remember *Vossius* saith he saw seven hundr'd Manuscript Copies of the *Hebrew* Bible in one Library. The Rector perhaps can tell what *Jewish* Doctors they were borrow'd of.

But suppose our present *Hebrew* Copies had come from the modern *Jews*, it does not follow *they made bold with them in Prejudice to Christianity*, as the Rector *suspects*. This suspicious Gentleman ought to shew us wherein they have Corrupted them.

Had they falsified the Scripture in Prejudice of Christianity, doubtless they would have expung'd the Chief Prophecies concerning Jesus Christ: But that they have not done, for those Places wherein the *Greek* and *Latin* Bibles differ from the *Hebrew*, seldom concern the *Christian Faith*, and the *Hebrew* Copies do often make more against the *Jews* than the *Greek* and *Latin* Versions; as for instance, in *Psalm*, 2. 12. *receive discipline*, so the *Greek* and *Latin*, from which nothing can be directly urg'd against the *Jews*; but the *Hebrew*, נשקו־בר *kiss the Son*, is an invincible Argument against them. Have the *Jews* Corrupted their Copies that they might give a more express Testimony to the *Son of God?*

That the *Hebrew* Copies are not depraved by the modern *Jews* is evident from their Agreement with those which *Jerom* used. It's apparent to any one that will be at the Pains to compare them, that wherein our Copies differ from the LXX, they generally agree with that which *Jerom* used, as far as we have any Account of it in his Writings.

The Learned *Salomon Glassius*, Professor of the Holy Tongues at *Jena*, speaks of a very Ancient Manuscript of the *Hebrew* Bible in their Colledge, curiously Writ-

ten in Royal Parchment. This he carefully examin'd for the greateſt Part, and could not obſerve it to vary from other Copies in the leaſt tittle, but that ſome Words were omitted at the firſt writing, which upon the review were ſupplied *.

IV. I will add one other Argument for the Purity of the *Hebrew* Text. If the *Jews* neither cou'd nor wou'd have Corrupted the *Hebrew* Copies, it follows that they have not Corrupted them.

1*ſt*. They cou'd not Corrupt all the *Hebrew* Copies, if they had been never ſo deſirous, for there was a pure Copy in every Synagog in the World beſides thoſe in the Hands of Chriſtians. Now, is it poſſible that ſo many Copies in diſtant Countries and Places ſhou'd be all Corrupted, and not one left to detect the Fraud? It is very abſur'd to fancy a general Conſpiracy between the *Jewiſh* Doctors to falſify all their Bibles, and that in ſuch Texts where they had no Intereſt to ſerve, and in the mean Time to leave the great Prophecies concerning Jeſus Chriſt untouch'd? Had ſuch a piece of Villany been attempted, I doubt not but the World had rung of it long ago. That watchful Providence which hath preſerv'd the Holy Scriptures from the deſtructive Rage of Perſecutors, and the corrupting Attempts of cunning Hereticks, † wou'd doubtleſs have raiſed up ſome Inſtruments to aſſert the Purity of the Divine Law; nay rather than ſo helliſh a Combination ſhou'd take Effect, I queſtion not but among the very Actors themſelves ſome wou'd have been influenced by the ſovereign Director of humane Intellects, to detect and oppoſe ſo Vile a Practice. To phancy ſuch an univerſal Corruption of the *Hebrew* Copies, is to dream that the World is gover n'd without a Providence, and that the chiefeſt Objects of it's peculiar Care, the *Scripture* and the *Church*, are left in the Power of reſtleſs and malicious Adverſaries.

Juſtin Martyr takes notice of the providential Care of Heaven in preſerving the Holy Bible in the *Jewiſh* Synagogues for the Uſe of the Chriſtian Church. *It muſt be aſſigned to the Divine Providence*, ſaith he, *that our Religion is at this Day preſerved among the* Jews, *to whom becauſe we wou'd not give Occaſion to reproach us by Producing the Scriptures out of our Church, we chuſe rather to produce 'em out of the Synagogue, of the* Jews, &c. ||

Auſtin thinks it very Incredible, " That the *Jewiſh* Nation, ſcatter'd far and wide " through the World, cou'd conſpire together to write a Lye, and while they envy " the Benefit of the Scripture unto others, ſhou'd deprive themſelves of the Truth--- " God forbid that any ſenſible Man ſhou'd believe the moſt perverſe and malicious " *Jews* to be ever able to effect ſo much, in ſo many Copies, and thoſe diſperſed far " and wide §.

Jerom laughs at the Sillineſs of thoſe who think the *Hebrew* Copies falſified. *Auſtin* calls the *Jews Capſarios noſtros, qui ſtudentibus nobis Codices portant*. * They are Library-keepers, and Book-carriers to the Students in Chriſtianity.

2*dly*. As they cou'd not, ſo we have reaſon to believe, *they won'd not* impoſe upon us, for they were *Religious even to Superſtition* in preſerving the Scripture intire, as the Rector hath noted. What our Saviour ſaith, *that one jot or one tittle ſhou'd in no wiſe paſs from the Law, till all be fulfilled*, has been made good. The *Jews* themſelves were of the ſame Mind: Their own Expoſitions, as Dr. *Lightfoot* obſerves, will atteſt to this Truth as to both thoſe Words that our Saviour hath, *viz*. Ἰῶτα ἓν, ἢ μία κεραία it's little to be doubted, that our Saviour means the letter *Jod*, concerning which, the *Jeruſal. Talmud* hath this Paſſage, *Sanh. fo*. 20. *col*. 3.

---

* ---*Nè punctulo quidem à Codicibus aliis diſcrepare, animadvertere potui.* Philol. Sacræ lib. I. tract. I. p. 23. † *Niceph Eccl. hiſt.* IV. 21. || *Servari autem etiam nunc apud Judæos noſtram Religionem, Dei erga nos eſt providentiæ.* Serm. ad Gent. § ---*Abſit ut prudens aliquis vel Judæus cujuſlibet perverſitatis, atq; malitiæ tantum poſſe credat in codicibus tam multis, & tam longè lateq; diſperſis.* Aug. de Civ. Dei. XV. 13. * Aug. in Pſam. 40. al. 41.

The

The Book of Mishneh Torah (*Deuteronomy*) *came prostrate to complain that* Solomon *sought to root* Jod *out of it* (viz. לֹא יִרְבֶּה נָשִׁים *he shall not multiply Wives*) *The holy blessed God saith to it,* Solomon *and a thousand such as he shall fail, but a Word of the Law shall not fail.*

About *una regula*, which signifies one of those little *apiculi* that distinguish between *Hebrew* Letters, they have several Passages. *Tanchum* Fol. 1. *He that makes* ה a ח or ד a ר *destroys the World.* See several Instances of this used in the learned Author. *Bi. vol. I. p.* 374. 375.

The *Jews* used the greatest Care and Caution imaginable in Transcribing the Law. They examin'd all Copies with a most Religious diligence. If there were but two or three Faults in every Leaf, one may mend and read them in Private, say the *Masters*, but if there were more Faults, such a Bible was not allow'd for private Use. *Li. ibid.*

In every Synagogue they had a true Copy, and it was their Care every where to have their Bible as purely Authentick as possible, as may be seen by the curious Rules that are given to that purpose in *Massech. Sopherim*, &c. Thus far Dr. *Light.* in whom you may see much more to the same purpose.

The modern *Jews* retain the Zeal of their Ancestors for the Purity of the Divine Law, *Rom.* 10. 2. *Act.* 21. 20. They have the most Religious regard to their Bible, they never put it in an unclean Place, nor touch it with defiled Hands, and if it happens to touch the Ground, they keep a publick Fast, to obviate the Judgment which such an Accident portends.

If a Copy had but one Corruption, it was not admitted into the Synagog, but to be buried in an Earthen Vessel, and never to be used, but in extreme Necessity a poor Man might teach his Children to read in it, but must not bring it into the Synagog, nor apply it to any other Use. To this unparallelled Vigilancy and Care is owing the perfect Harmony and surprizing Consent of the Manuscript Copies of the *Hebrew* Bible throughout the World at this Day. No one Copy, written by a *Jew*, can be produced (as learned *Hebricians* have affirm'd) that has the least disagreement with their other Copies, except it be in some *Masoretick* Notes, and in the *Keri's* and *Kethibs*. It were well if the *Christians* in their Editions of the Bible did imitate the great Diligence of the *Jews*, whose exemplary Zeal, and curious Circumspection in revising and correcting their Bibles inexcusably condemns the general remisness of Christian Printers. *Maimon. in Polan. ubi supra.*

CHAP. V.

Containing an Answer to the Rector's Objections against the Purity of the Hebrew *Text.*

HAVING vindicated my *Arguments* for the *Purity* of the *Hebrew* Copies, I shall now consider what the Rector can say against it.

I. His first Exception to the Purity of the *Hebrew* is taken out of *Just. Martyr*, who charg'd *the* Jews *with Corrupting the Scriptures.* To this I answer'd, with *Corrupting the* Greek, *but not the* Hebrew. For this the Rector very scornfully demands my *Reason.* p. 24.

My reason is, because *Just. Mart.* expresly mentions their Corrupting the Lxx, and no where speaks of their Corrupting the *Hebrew* Copies.

His Words are these, *I wou'd have you know that they* (the Jews) *have expung'd out of the* Translation of the Elders *that were with* Ptolomy *many insire Texts, in which is clearly foretold that this Crucified one shou'd be God and Man, and that he must be hanged on a Tree and dye for us* *.

When he speaks of the *Holy Scriptures* indefinitely, we are to understand him of the Lxx, *Version*, which was the only Scripture most of the Fathers were acquainted with. He tells the *Jews* (among other Corruptions) they had alter'd *Isa.* 7. 14. which in the Lxx. is, *behold a Virgin* (παρθένος) *shall bring forth*; this they alter'd into νεᾶνις—— behold a *Young Woman* shall bring forth: And so it is to this Day in *Aquila's* Version, which the *Jews* prefer'd to that of the Lxx. It does not appear that they had chang'd the Original, עלמה but the Controversy was, whether it ought to be render'd παρθένος a *Virgin*, with the Lxx, νεᾶνις a *Young Woman*, as *Aquila* had corruptly render'd it †.

The Rector asks, *is it no Fault to Corrupt the Lxx?* Yes, doubtless, it is the height of Wickedness to Corrupt the Word of God in any Version; but we owe it to the special Providence of God that the Original have been preserved intire, by which all Translations are to be examined, and the Corruptions of 'em detected.

But, saith the Rector, " if the Corruption had been only in the Lxx, they wou'd " have let *Justin* know that their *Hebrew* Bibles were intire. *p.* 24.

The Charge being only about Corrupting the *Greek* Bibles, they had no Occasion to speak of the *Hebrew*; and it should seem *Justin* himself was a Stranger to that Language, for he saith *Israel* signifies *homo vincens Virtutem*, *Isra* is a Man, and *El* is Vertue or Stength, according to *Justin*. A Novice in the *Hebrew* knows how to correct this *Etymology*. Nay the very *Hellenists*, or the *Greciz'ing Jews* that lived without the borders of their own Land, were generally unacquainted with the *Hebrew*, his Friend *Vossius* affirms that after the Captivity the *Hebrew* was lost in *Palestine* it self, and then no wonder the *Jew* that discourses with *Justin* makes no mention of the Purity of the *Hebrew* Bibles, to which he might be as great a Stranger as *Justin* himself.

II. " The passages objected by *Justin* (as the Rector adds) are still wanting in " our *Hebrew* Bibles, for instance, *Psalm*, 96. 10. *say among* the Heathen the Lord " hath reigned, but *Justin* tells *Trypho* that ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου had been struck out by the " *Jews*, and that the Place shou'd run thus, *the Lord hath reigned from the Wood* or " Cross. These Words, *from the Cross*, are not in the *Hebrew* or Lxx. at this Day. " The *Hebrew* Copy in *Jerom's* days wanted the same Words, and they are to be " found in *Austin*, *Cyprian*, *Tertull.* &c. as *Flam. Nobilius* affirms. *p.* 25.

Here the Rector advances a bold Charge against the *Catholick Church*, as consenting at least to the Corrupting of God's Word, and that in an illustrious Prediction of the Manner of Christs Death, whom they had so little a regard to (according to the Charitable Rector) as to neglect the restoring so famous a Prophecy to it's due Place in the Bible, and that after they were told of the Corruption of *Just. Martyr.* This is a very severe Charge against the *whole Generation of the Righteous.* You see the Dissenters have a great deal of good Company that suffer with them under the Rector's unjust Criminations of being Corrupters of the Word of God.

It must be confessed that *Justin's* Copy of the Lxx. had the Words, *from the Wood*, and this was follow'd by some of the Fathers, but the more Correct Copies had 'em not. That they were not Originally in the Lxx. will appear, if we consider,

---

* *Ac quod illi multos & integros locos illarum ex translatione eorum, qui cum* Ptolomæo *fuere* Seniorum *sustulerint*, &c. *Just. in Dial. cum Tryphon.* † *Vos autem* (saith he) *and in his mutare expositiones* Seniorum *vestrorum qui fuere apud* Ptolomæum, Ægyptiorum *Regem, audetis, dicentes non habere Scripturum sicut illi verterunt sed ecce* juvencula *in utero concipiet.* Just. ibid.

1. That

1. That *Jerome*, who translatrd both the *Hebrew* and Lxx into *Latine*, takes no notice of them, which doubtleſs he would have done, if they had been either in the *Hebrew* or *Greek* Copies; he had the genuine Copies of the Lxx, out of *Origen*'s *Hexapla*. It may be therefore preſum'd, that *Juſtin Martyr* found theſe words in ſome corrupt Copy of the Lxx, which *Jerome* calls *verſio κοινὴ*, as we obſerv'd before.

2. The *Latine Verſion*, which all allow to be Ancient, has 'em not: No more are they to be found in the *Alexandrian* or *Roman*, or any other Copies of the Lxx at this day; nor in the *Arab*, *Ethiopic* (which follow the Lxx in moſt things) nor in the *Syriac* or *Chaldee* Paraphraſe. Have the *Jews* been able to corrupt all the Copies of theſe Verſions, that were in the hands of Chriſtians? Did the Chriſtians treacherouſly deliver up all the *Greek* and *Latine* Bibles, which were innumerable, to be corrupted by the *Jews*? If we ſhou'd ſuppoſe 'em to be able to alter their own *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies, is it poſſible they ſhould be able to falſifie all the Bibles through the whole Chriſtian World? *Credat Judæus Apella!*

3. Is it likely that ſuch a clear Prophecy concerning the Croſs of Chriſt had been over-lookt in the New Teſtament, where ſeveral more obſcure ones are Cited, and applied to his Paſſion? There's ſcarce a circumſtance of his Sufferings but the Evangeliſts apply ſome Old-Teſtament-Prophecy to it, and they uſually note, that ſuch an Event happen'd for the *fulfilling of the Scriptures*. Now had there been ſuch a Prediction as this upon Record, that *the Lord ſhou'd reign from the Wood*, it is highly probable, That Chriſt and his Apoſtles wou'd have taken notice of it, as they do of thoſe that are more dark and abſtruſe. This Omiſſion is a plain Evidence, That it was not in the Bible in Chriſt's and the Apoſtle's time; and if not then, it never was in the *Hebrew* Bible, which the Rector allows was not corrupted in any *material thing* before the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*.

4. Mr. *Nich. Fuller*, who has a learned Diſſertation upon this Subject, conceives, that ſome Chriſtian, obſerving that theſe Words, *the Lord reigneth*, treated of the Kingdom of Chriſt, added in the Margin by way of Explication, *from the Wood*, which the next Tranſcriber, taking it for a various Reading, boldly incerted into the Text, and ſo it might eaſily ſpread into more Copies, than the few the Rector mentions, as *ye* and *we* in *Acts* 6. 3. hath done. Mr. *F.* quotes *Faber*, ſaying, that theſe words are not *de Hebraica veritate*, but added by *Chriſtian Devotion*.

I will conclude with *Fuller*'s Cenſure, *An verò os aliquod impurum dicere auſit*, &c. *But dare any foul mouth affirm, that either thoſe Verſions* (Gr. & Lat.) *or the Catholick Church (which hath approved them for ſo many Ages) have conſpired in ſo horrid a wickedneſs with the perfidious enemies of Jeſus Chriſt?* Full. Miſcell. Theol. lib. 3. cap. 13.

III. The Rector believes upon *Voſſius*'s Judicious Authority, that the *Hebrew Chronology* is corrupted, his Argument is this, *The* Jews *believ'd their* Meſſiah *wou'd come about the* 6000 *Year from the Creation*; *that the World was* 6000 *Years old when Chriſt came*; *that the Ancient* Hebrew Copies *reckoned* 6000 *Years from* Adam *to* Jeſus, *elſe the Jews cou'd not have expected the Meſſiah when* Jeſus *was born, if their Chronology had been the ſame as it is this day*; *from the whole it muſt be confeſſed, that the Modern* Hebrew Copies *are corrupted, the World, according to them, being at the Birth of* Jeſus *but about* 4000 *Years old.* p. 25 & 26.

The Rector barely propoſes this Aurgment, but neither explains nor attempts to prove the parts of it. I'll briefly examine each of them.

1. It cannot be prov'd that the Ancient Jews expected their Meſſiah about the 6000 Year of the World. *Voſſius* endeavours to prove it from a *Talmudical Tradition*, which the Jews aſcribe to *Elias*, and *Voſſius* believes to be *Elias* the Prophet.

The Tradition of the houſe of *Elias* is this, *The World ſhall laſt Six Thouſand Years*; *two Thouſand Years before the Law, two Thouſand Years of the Law, and two Thouſand Years of the time of the Meſſiah*; *but for our iniquities, which are many, thoſe Years are paſs'd and lapſed. Mundus conſtrabit*, &c. In Tract. Sanhedr.

If.

If. *Voſſius* begins theſe 6000 Years from the Floud, and ſo reckons forward to the Birth of Chriſt; but he ought to begin from the Creation, for the *Tradition* ſpeaks of the Age of the World, that it ſhou'd laſt ſix thouſand Years, alluding to the *ſix days of the Creation*, accounting 1000 to anſwer each day. His reaſon for reckoning from the Floud, is taken from 2 *Pet.* 3. 6. who calls the Old World, *the World that then was.* This is nothing to the point in hand, for the Queſtion is not whether the *Antediluvian World* may be ſo call'd, but whether *Elias* intended to exclude that State of the World, or the time before the Floud, from being concern'd in this *Tradition.* This neither is, nor can be prov'd. Now if we reckon the 6000 Years from the beginning of the Creation, it's co-incident with the *Chronology* of our *Hebrew Bibles*, which make the World about 4000 Years old when Chriſt was born, and ſo doth this *Tradition*, for it aſſigns 2000 years before the Law, and 2000 years under the Law, at the end of which it makes the *Meſſiah* to come.

The Truth is, This is a *Rabbinical Figment*, and no *Prophecy of Elias*, as *Voſſius* affirms without proof. Perhaps the Author might be ſome *Talmudic Doctor* of that Name. It gives a falſe account of the time before the Law, which was about 2450 Years, and of the time under the Law, which was about 1500 Years, and not 2000 as he affirms. Some have calculated the Duration of the World by this pretended Prophecy, and have been ſo vain as to affirm, that the Laſt Judgment will be at the end of 6000 Years from the Creation, grounding their Opinion upon this *Rabbinical Tradition.*

Beſides, the Jews acknowledge that the time of the Coming of the Meſſiah is already paſt, *tho' he be hid from them for their ſins:* This is inconſiſtent with their defalking 2000 Years from the Chronology of the *Hebrew Bible*, that they may perſwade the World the time of his appearance is not yet come.

They are ſenſible enough, that the time of the Meſſia's coming is lapſed, whatever ſome of them may ſay to the contrary; and therefore they pronounce a ſolemn Curſe upon the Computers of Times, *Malè pereunt* (ſay the *Talmudiſts*) *qui tempora articulos ſuppetunt quibus venturus eſt Meſſiah. Let their Bones rot* (ſays *R. Jonathan*) *who compute the times of the end.*

2. It can't be prov'd that the World was 2000 years old when Chriſt came. According to the *Hebrew* Copies, which I have prov'd incorrupt, the World was about 4000 years old when the Son of God was manifeſted in the Fleſh. There is no reaſon why we ſhou'd eſteem the *Greek* Chronology before the *Hebrew* Bibles. It's abſurd to prefer a *Tranſlation* to the *Original*, the Streams to the Fountain. Even thoſe that follow the Lxx Chronology, do not make the World 6000 Years old when Chriſt came. *Theophilus Antiochen* and the *Oriental Church* reckon about 5507 from the Creation to the Birth of Chriſt. *Ad Antolyc, lib.* 3. *Nicephorus* reckons 5505. *Eccl. Hiſt.* I. 10.

We are ſure the *Greek* Chronology has been either corrupted very early, or falſified by the Lxx Tranſlators, for it makes *Methuſelah* to live 14 Years after the Floud; hence came that famous Queſtion, where to lodge him all the time of the Floud.

Some held (as St. *Auſtin* obſerves) *that he was with his Father* Enoch, *who was tranſlated. This they held* (adds he) *as being loth to derogate from the Authority of thoſe Books, which the Church hath entertained into more renowned Authority, and thinking that the Books of the* Jews, *rather than theſe, do miſtake and err. For they ſay, its not credible, that the* Lxx *Interpreters, which tranſlated at one time, and in one ſenſe, could err, or would lye or err, where it concern'd them not; but that the* Jews, *for envy they bear us---have chang'd ſome things in their Books, that the Authority of ours might be leſſen'd.*

This is their Opinion, his own he gives a little after, *Let that Tongue be rather believ'd, out of which a Tranſlation is made into another by Interpreters.* And in the next Chap. (chap. 14.) *The Truth of things muſt be fetch'd out of that Tongue, out of which that that we have is interpreted.* Aug. de Civit. Dei, xv. 11. 13, 14.

It

It is true, the Fathers generally follow'd the *Greek* Chronology, and how cou'd they do otherwise, since few of 'em were able to read the Bible in *Hebrew*.

3. The ancient *Hebrew* Copies did not reckon 6000 Years from *Adam* to *Jesus*, as the Rector affirms. They reckon'd, as we do now, as appears by the Copy which *Jerom* us'd, of which he gives this account, *That where the Greek Translation saith the Patriarchs before the Floud were so many years above two hundred years old, when they begat such a Son, the* Hebrew *Copy saith they were so many years above* one hundred *years old.* So that the 100 years which are added to the lives of the *Antediluvian* Patriarchs in the Lxx Version (which make about 600 Years in all) were not in the Ancient *Hebrew* Copies. *Sciendum quod utq; ad,* &c. *Hieron. in quæst. seu Tradit. Hebr. præm.*

But saith the Rector out of *Vossius*, *The* Jews *cou'd not have expected the* Messiah *when* Jesus *was born, if this Chronology had been the same as it is this day.*

Doubtless that *Chronology* was the same, and they had just reasons to expect the Messiah then, for *Daniel*'s Weeks were at an end; the *Scepter was departed from Judah*; *John the Baptist*, the *forerunner* of the Messiah had awakened their expectations.

Vossius's main Argument (as the Rector calls these) being answer'd, what follows is of less Consideration: however, I will make some short reflections on his two last Arguments, which are as follows:

IV. Cainan *the Son of* Arphaxad, *mention'd* Luke 4. 35, 36. *is left out in* Gen. 11. 12. *which is a demonstration saith the Rector, that the Jews have corrupted the* Hebrew.

This Argument has been judiciously answer'd by several Learned Pens, as the Reader may see in *Pool*, to whom I remit him. *Sin. Cris. in Luc.* 3.

I shall only take notice of what Doctor *Lightfoot* says to it. He affirms it added to *Moses*'s Text by Interpreters, for these reasons: 1. No reason can be given why it should be left out of the *Hebrew* Text. 2. But a probable reason may be given why it should be added in the Greek, *The Jews esteemed the Seventy Souls that went into* Egypt, *beyond the Seventy Nations of the World.* This arrogant Doctrine must needs expose 'em to hatred and danger amongst the *Gentiles*. To avoid this, the Interpreters added another *Cainan*, and *five souls* to those Lxx in *Jacob*'s retinue. They took care that the *Gentiles* should not in the *Greek* Bibles find exactly the Lxx Nations in *Gen.* 10. but 72 or 73, (if we reckon *Elisa* also) as also not 70 but 75 souls that went down into *Egypt*.

The same craft they us'd in *Deut.* 32. 8. which they read, *according to the number of the Angels of God*, whence the comparison between the 70 souls and the 70 Nations took its rise.

3. Nothing more usual with them than to add according to their pleasure, *Gen.* 10. 2. *Elisa* is added, and *v.* 22. another *Cainan* among the Sons of *Sem*. So that they have added two *Cainans* to the *Original Text*, one the Son of *Noah*, the other the Son of *Arphaxad*, and Grand-son of *Noah*. *Gen.* 46. 20. they have added five Grand-children to the Sons of *Joseph*, and in *v.* 27. they reckon up 7 Grand-children to him. Shall we believe the *Greek* or *Hebrew* Bibles? Let Reason and the Nature of the thing judge. If these 5 were with *Joseph*, when *Jacob* and his Family went down into *Egypt* (and if they were not, why are they numbred among those that went down into *Egypt*) then must *Manasseh* at the age of 9 or 10 at the most, be a Grand-Father *Ephraim* at 8 or 9. But how comes St. *Luke* to follow the 70, and to insert this additional *Cainan*? To that the Dr. answers,

1. *Luke* wrote to the Gentiles, and therefore must follow the Heathens Bible in his Quotations. 2. In the Genealogies he was to be a Copier, and not a Corrector. If he had not inserted it, the *Gentiles*, who were only capable of consulting the *Gr.* Copies, might have call'd his Veracity in question; as to the other part of the Genealogy, which had been extracted out of Tables and Registers not familiarly known, *Luke* is a faithful Transcriber. Thus *Jude* mentions *Michael* striving with *Satan*; and the Apostle names *Jannes* and *Jambres* (2 *Tim.* 3. 9.) they do not deliver these as certain things, but refer to the common Tradition.

3.

3*dly*. *Ariſteas* and *Joſephus* ſay, *when* [illegible] *ved*, *Demetrius* commanded that according to their Cuſtom, [illegible] Curſes upon any that ſhou'd by addition, or alteration, or diminution any Change in it. 4*thly*. He follow'd the Lxx. to ſhew that there was no a diſtinction as was imagined between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and that he m fort the *Gentiles* concerning their coming in. See more in the learned A I. *p*. 488, 490. *Vol*. II. *p*. 401, 402, 404.

V. The Rector has one other Corruption to Charge the *Hebrew* Cop " *Pſal*. 22. 16. *As a Lyon*, inſtead of, *they pierced my Hands* and Feet, [illegible] 15. 24. and the Lxx. This Place (if it be a Corruption) has not bee ted in all *Hebrew* Copies, the *Jews* themſelves being Witneſſes. *R. Jacob Be* the reſtorer of the *Maſora* (*in Bibl. Venet*.) ingenuouſly confeſſes that he the reading כארו or כארי *they pierced* in ſome Copies, *Johan. Iſaac Levita*, *Jew* became a *Chriſtian*, affirms the ſame of a *Hebrew Pſalter* that was h fathers. Several *Hebrew* Bibles have both readings כארי in the Text and Margin, and *Grotius* acknowledges both to be Ancient, ſo doth Dr. *Hamm* obſerves (as *Glaſſius* did before him) that the *Chald*. joyns both reading dring the Place, *mordentes ſicut leo manus meas* *. Our *Engliſh* Tranſlato the marginal reading כרו *they have pierced*, as being at Liberty to chuſe ei ing, and the *Jews* themſelves in other Places prefer the *Keri*, or margina Of the two readings here no wonder the modern *Jews* ſhould prefer that w moſt to favour their Cauſe. The famous and indefatigable *Dan. Bomberg* ned himſelf in publiſhing the noble *Venetian* Edition of the *Maſoretic* Bib have reſtor'd the marginal reading into the Text, but the *Jew* that cor Preſs, diverted him from his Intention, by threatning to hinder the Sale pies among his Country-men. The learned *Glaſſius*, who was a great Cri *Hebrew* Tongue, ſaith that כארי *as a Lyon*, ought to be render'd (as) *pierced*, and that כארי is the 3*d*. *plur*. *præter* in *Kal* of כרה but in an *form*, א being inſerted, as is uſual in other Words, and י put in the end *Ezr*. 10. 44. נאשו *they had taken* for נשאו He refers to more Examples kind, as in *Jer*. 50. 11. and he calls this Letter, as *Brixianus* and others before him, not *Fod* but a *diminutive* Vau, which is therefore thus Writt *clarè innat clavorum Chriſti ſtigmata*: To ſignify the *Marks* of the Nails Hands and Feet. Hence it is written in *Codregiis* כארו as if י had bee of ו as it in *Jer*. 50. 11. four ſeveral Times, and ſo it is uſed in other Pl

Thus I have Vindicated the *Hebrew* Bibles, and our *Engliſh* Bibles, wh Tranſlation of 'em, from the *Corruptions* with which the Rector hath thou *reproach* them. I deſire the Reader to conſider whether this Gentleman d be Credited in *Reflections* upon the *Diſſenters*, who ſo vilely *Reflects* on t Bibles, which he wou'd have us believe are Corrupted by the *Jews* in *materi* eſpecially in *Pſ*. 96. 10. *Gen*. 11. 12. and in the *Chronology*, in which abo Years are loſt. So that according to theſe *Corrupt* Bibles we cannot prove th is come in the Fleſh, for the World muſt be 6000. Years old when Chri come (if we may believe the Rector) but according to our *Engliſh* Bibl but above 4000 Years old when he was Born. In ſhort, the brought us to this paſs, *either we muſt reject the Authority of our Engliſh* Point of Chronology) *or deny that Chriſt is come in the Fleſh*. Chriſt come till the World was 6000 Years old, as the Rector tells us, and ac our *Engliſh* Bibles, it is not 6000 Years old to this Day. Mr. *Gippes* is a tron to the *Chriſtian Cauſe*, which is as much obliged to him as the D Speak out your Mind, ſweet Sir, ſhall we burn our *Corrupt Bibles* || that a in Jeſus Chriſt? Or ſhall we deny his Coming, to ſave our Bibles? You you pleaſe, good Mr. Rector, but I am ſatisfied the *Church of England* and thren the *Diſſenters*, will neither renounce their Chriſtianity, nor their Bi

* *Duplex fuit antiquitus lectio*. Grot. in loc. † Vid. *Glaſſ. de Script. ſtyl.* lib. 1. p. 114. || *Serm*. p. 27.

FINIS.